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ABSTRACT

This study examines two facets of the reception of Ovid’s *Tristia* in the 16th century: its commentary tradition and its adaptation by Latin poets. It lays the groundwork for a more comprehensive study of the Renaissance reception of the *Tristia* by providing a scholarly platform where there was none before (particularly with regard to the unedited, unpublished commentary tradition), and offers literary case studies of poetic postscripts to Ovid’s *Tristia* in order to explore the wider impact of Ovid’s exilic imaginary in 16th-century Europe. After a brief introduction, the second chapter introduces the three major commentaries on the *Tristia* printed in the Renaissance: those of Bartolomaeus Merula (published 1499, Venice), Veit Amerbach (1549, Basel), and Hecules Ciofanus (1581, Antwerp) and analyzes their various contexts, styles, and approaches to the text. The third chapter shows the commentators at work, presenting a more focused look at how these commentators apply their differing methods to the same selection of the *Tristia*, namely Book 2. These two chapters combine to demonstrate how commentary on the *Tristia* developed over the course of the 16th century: it begins from an encyclopedic approach, becomes focused on rhetoric, and is later aimed at textual criticism, presenting a trajectory that
becomes increasingly focused and philological. Chapter 4 is the first of two case studies in 16th-century Latin elegy. It examines the Polish poet laureate Klemens Janicki (1516-1543) and the book of elegies he provocatively entitled *Tristium Liber*. The chapter provides a biographical section, and elaborates the literary process by which his adaptation of Ovid functions by focusing on how Janicki assumes the Ovidian exilic persona as a tool for ethical and political critiques.

The final chapter is a study of a selection of the Latin elegies written by Joachim du Bellay (1522-1560) while he was ‘exiled’ to Rome. It first examines the *Tristia* as nostalgic poetry, and shows how du Bellay uses the exilic persona to explore the idealization and privileging of the physical site of Rome and to establish himself in the aesthetic space of nostalgia created by Ovid in the *Tristia* and *Ex Ponto* as a means to assert his poetic autonomy.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

The problem that the present work addresses is by and large a problem of empty space. To date, there remains no volume that is solely dedicated to the reception of Ovid’s *Tristia* in the Renaissance. The dearth of information on the rich commentary tradition of the 16th century represents a significant void in the history of the reception of Ovid’s exile poetry. Much of the Neo-Latin elegy that stems from this fascinating period and engages with the Augustan poet’s exilic creations remains almost entirely unexplored in scholarly literature.¹ (This is particularly true of those elegies which were penned by poets who are not already household names.) Wilfried Stroh’s survey of the *Nachleben of the Tristia*, published in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt (ANRW)*, skips from Petrarch to a desultory mention of Joachim Du Bellay’s *Regrets*, then on to Goethe and Schiller in the 19th century.² This study seeks to lay the groundwork for a more comprehensive study of the Renaissance reception of the *Tristia*, to provide

¹ Much more scholarship has been centered on vernacular poets, however, and unsurprisingly focused on Shakespeare and Spenser (e.g. M. L. Stapleton, *Spenser’s Ovidian Poetics* (Newark, DE: Univ. of Delaware Press), 41-73.
a scholarly platform where there was none before (especially with regard to the unedited, unpublished commentary tradition), while at the same time offering literary case studies of poetic postscripts to Ovid’s *Tristia* to explore the wider impact of Ovid’s exilic imaginary in 16th-century Europe.

Ovid’s *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto* (not to mention the *Ibis*) are often, it seems, considered to be the ‘final frontier’ of Ovidian studies; interest in these works always lags behind the cyclical resurgences of interest in the amatory elegies and the monolithic *Metamorphoses*. The most recent generation of Ovidian scholarship has seen a burst of new interest in Ovid’s Black Sea compositions, which finds its beginnings in the works of Jo-Marie Claassen and particularly in the excellent psychological examination enacted upon the exilic Ovid’s persona by Gareth Williams’ *Banished Voices*. More recently, a new translation by Peter Green has made these poems more available to the general reader. The past several years have seen the publication of a volume of Claassen’s collected essays on the exilic poetry in *Ovid Revisited*, as well as monographs by Martin Amman

---

on Ovidian humor,⁷ and by Matthew McGowan, who presents a careful exploration of the figuration of Augustus in these elegies.⁸ Furthermore, there have been two important volumes by Jennifer Ingleheart, the first a new edition of Tristia 2 with commentary,⁹ and the second, Two Thousand Years of Solitude, an important collection of essays by several scholars, dealing exclusively with issues of reception of Ovid’s exile ranging from Petrarch to Pushkin.¹⁰ About a quarter of this work is devoted to Renaissance topics.¹¹ It is to this still expanding body of work that I seek to add my study in order to offer background context to the way in which understanding of the Tristia as a text and its author’s poetic persona has developed out of a tradition of both textual exegesis and poetic literary critique.

I have opted to use the plural ‘receptions’ in the title of this project because it proceeds down precisely these two lines of inquiry, resulting in a final shape that is somewhat bifurcated, with each portion representative of a certain type of reading. The first half, which treats the Renaissance commentary tradition, investigates how the majority of its readers encountered and experienced the Tristia at that time. It focuses on what might be termed an

---

⁷ Martin Amman, Komik in den Tristien Ovids (Basel: Schwabe Verlag, 2006.)
¹¹ I refer here to the essays of L. B. T. Houghton, Stephen Hinds, Mandy Green, Liz Oakley-Brown, and Jennifer Ingleheart in the volume cited above.
intensive reading of the text; it is more a work of reception history, tracking the
developments of how and why the Tristia was read in the 16th century, along
with its textual transmission. The latter half consists of two case studies which
present Latin poetic responses to the Tristia written by two 16th-century poets:
Klemens Janicki (1516-1543) and Joachim du Bellay (1522-1560). This section
assumes a more extensive mode of reading for these literary artists, and provides
a literary analysis of how the poets adapt Ovid’s exilic works as a whole and his
poetic persona for use in their own works.

I. The commentaries

The scholarly community has recently benefitted from a renewed interest
in textual commentary ranging in date from antiquity to the present day, a fact
that is demonstrated by several recently published volumes of collected essays
on the subject, including those edited by Besomi and Caruso,12 Most,13 Gibson
and Kraus,14 and Pade.15 Book-length studies dedicated to elucidating the
Renaissance commentary traditions of particular works of Ovid have also sprung
up: Ann Moss’s (somewhat ambitiously titled) Latin Commentaries on Ovid from

13 Glenn W. Most, ed., Commentaries - Kommentare. Aporemata: Kritische Studien zur
Philologiegeschichte, Band 4 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1999).
14 Roy K. Gibson and Christina Shuttleworth Kraus, eds., The Classical Commentary: Histories,
15 Marianne Pade, ed., On Renaissance Commentaries (Hildesheim-Zurich-New York: Georg Olms,
2005).
the Renaissance examines a variety of commentators on the *Metamorphoses*,\(^\text{16}\) while Paul White has treated the *Heroides* in Renaissance France,\(^\text{17}\) and Angela Fritsen the *Fasti* in Renaissance Italy.\(^\text{18}\) The Renaissance commentary tradition of the *Tristia*, however, remains almost entirely unexplored.\(^\text{19}\) It is to remedy this problem that I have undertaken a study of the three major commentaries of the era on the *Tristia*, those of Bartolomaeus Merula (1499, Venice), Veit Amerbach (1549, Basel), and Hercules Ciofanus (1581, Antwerp). Ann Moss’s *Ovid in Renaissance France* is the only place where the commentaries upon which this study focuses are mentioned in anything more than passing reference.\(^\text{20}\) This work remains the place with the most information on Merula’s commentary in general (he commented on nearly all of Ovid’s works), and the sweeping nature of Moss’s study prevents any in-depth discussion of either the man or his

---


\(^{17}\) Paul White, *Renaissance Postscripts: Responding to Ovid’s Heroides in Sixteenth-Century France* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 2009).

\(^{18}\) Angela Fritsen, forthcoming.


methods; Amerbach’s work as a commentator has fared even less well;\textsuperscript{21} Ciofanus is the only of the three to occasion extended mention (though not specifically in reference to his \textit{Tristia} commentary).\textsuperscript{22}

I open my discussion of my approach to these texts with a brief anecdote. As I was reading Jennifer Ingleheart’s recently published commentary on the second book of the \textit{Tristia}, one comment in particular grabbed my attention. It was not that its content was unjustified or that I was struck by its novelty, but rather the opposite: it was the comment’s overwhelming familiarity that peaked my interest. The comment was a gloss on the verb \textit{figere} (‘to fix, pierce, fasten’), a notable textual problem at \textit{Tr.} 2.473-4, a couplet which falls in the midst of Ovid’s notoriously confusing descriptions of various dice game.\textsuperscript{23} To bolster her own reading, Ingleheart there cites the commentary of the well-known scholar S. G. Owen, paraphrasing from his 1924 commentary, to clarify the presence of this

\textsuperscript{21} Though interest in Amerbach as a figure of the Reformation produced a biography: see Ludwig Fischer, \textit{Veit Troßmann von Wemding: genannt Vitus Amerpachius, als Professor in Wittenberg (1530-1543)}, (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1926).


\textsuperscript{23} \textit{quid valeant tali, quo possis plurima iactu / figere, damnosos effugiasve canes} (“what the dice beat, how you can pin down the most points with your toss and avoid the destructive ‘dogs’”). Many of the extant MSS read \textit{fingere} in place of \textit{figere}, hence the need to explain the reading.
unexpected verb. Following this thread back to its source, I reproduce Owen’s original comment:

*figere*, ‘secure’. Iuv. 9.139... The metaphor, taken from spearing game,... is helped out by *iactu*, which may be used of ‘hurling’ a javelin, Verg. *Aen.* XI.608.

Upon seeing this, I recalled something similar in the commentary of the German humanist Veit Amerbach. Amerbach’s text reads:

*miror, quare interpres pro figere, censuerit scribendum vincere, aut fingere, cum apta sit metaphorā propter ablatīum iactū, sumptā vel a sagittāriis, vel a venatoribus, pro lucrāri, aut vincere in hoc aleae certamine: sicut ferae vincuntur iactibus, et figendo, unde hoc etiam est Virgilī...*

I wonder why the commentator [here he means Bartolomaeus Merula] supposed that one should read *vincere* or *fingere* for *figere*, since the metaphor is fitting by means of the ablative *iactu*, taken up from archers or hunters for profiting or winning in this dice contest, in the same way that beasts are conquered by throws and piercing. This is also in Vergil...26

It is hardly my intention to accuse anyone of plagiarism; I only want to draw attention to the striking similarities, and state that such is the tralatitious nature of commentary. Amerbach finds no mention in Owen’s note, nor anywhere else;

---

24 Ingleheart, *Commentary*, 361: “Owen notes that this metaphor, taken from spearing game... is supported by *iactu*, used of the ‘cast’ of the javelin (e.g. Virgil, *Aen.* 11.608 *iactum teli*”).
we can be sure, however, that Owen was aware of the other major Renaissance commentators, since both Merula and Ciofanus are cited for emendations in his editions of the exile works.\textsuperscript{27} I hope that this example strikes a somewhat cautionary note and can, in its small way, serve as a partial justification for the study of these documents. Owen may have never seen Amerbach’s commentary; he may have drawn his interpretation from a later source that plundered it, or he may have even shamelessly taken it over for himself. It matters little. What is important is that even if these solutions were arrived at independently of one another, they represent two explanations, nearly four-hundred years removed, that are the same. It is clear that if we consider Owen (or Ingleheart for that matter) useful for better understanding Ovid’s \textit{Tristia}, then we ought to give due consideration to Amerbach and his contemporaries.\textsuperscript{28}

My goals in discussing the \textit{Tristia’s} Renaissance commentaries in this study are severalfold. First, I seek simply to bring to light the major extant exemplars of the tradition in the 16\textsuperscript{th} century and to present them in a manner useful to future readers of the \textit{Tristia}. This accounts for the expository nature of

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Amerbach offers the least textual elucidation of the three commentators, so this is possibly the source of Owen’s neglect of him.
\item The fact that the history of the Classics has always been an ‘implicit and ineliminable part’ of its various disciplines is encapsulated excellently in this statement by James I. Porter: “Just to analyze a text (for example) is to conjure up the history of that text; \textit{a line of commentary can hardly be read without reading up on or about earlier commentaries}; footnotes throw slivers of light upon predecessor generations; and in general arguments for novelty stand on the toes of giants, as well as on their shoulders.” (from “Reception Studies: Future Prospects.” In \textit{A Companion to Classical Receptions}, eds. Lorna Hardwick and Christopher Stray (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), 470, italics mine).
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
the commentary chapters, as their primary aim is to draw attention to the existence of these rich paratexts and their contents in a scholarly venue. As the anecdote above has shown, these commentaries can offer present-day readers and editors of the *Tristia* informed readings of the text that are just as valid as any modern commentary. This outlook is, of course, the product of my own biases in the study of classical literature, namely the belief that the more readings or ways of reading a text, the better. With this admittedly subjective view in mind, such a rich body of texts on the *Tristia* ought not to remain neglected.

To say that the commentaries under investigation have something to offer us—particularly after illustrating an instance of the similarity between a Renaissance and modern commentary as I have done above—is not, however, to say that their authors shared the exact concerns that present-day readers have when reading a text. My second aim, therefore, is to trace the development of the ways in which the *Tristia* was being read and utilized in the Renaissance; this is effected by way of a comparison of the commentaries with each other along the lines of emphases of approach, structure, and style. The present work demonstrates how, over the course of a century, the focus of commentary on the *Tristia* evolved dramatically, along with the role that the poems were expected to play in the life and education of their readers. This will be presented first in general terms, via an overview of the commentaries and their respective

---

29 In fact, the fact they do not have the same concerns could be seen as the very thing they have to offer us.
contexts, followed by a more side-by-side analysis of these different methods of reading at work on a select portion of the *Tristia*, Book 2.

I referenced above that the chapters on the *Tristia’s* commentaries present a study of the *intensive* reading Ovid’s works, and this term begs further clarification. This term conveniently expresses the most fundamental difference between the manner in which early moderns read classical works in comparison to readers of the present day. Their focus was intensive, that is, they tended to focus on very small portions of text, variable in size from whole couplets to single words, in their efforts to explicate and understand a work. With little exception, explication of a text does not range far beyond the particular ‘sense unit’ selected as the lemma and its immediate context; that is to say, the explanations are fairly self-contained. It is exceedingly rare to find exegesis within a commentary which relates a particular sense unit to what we might term broader literary argument about a work (or large section of a work) as a whole. The best evidence for this sort of practice is the commonplace book. This tool, which had developed into a standard form by the 16th century, “was a collection of quotations (usually Latin quotations) culled from authors held to be authoritative, or, at any rate, commendable in their opinions, and regarded as exemplary in terms of linguistic usage and stylistic niceties.”³⁰ Their name reflects the characteristic that marked these books out from any other collection

of quotes: they were categorized under particular headings, or places, that made them easier to access and utilize in creating one’s own Latin compositions in order to lend them both moral authority as well as stylistic correctness and flair. It is necessary to understand this sort of reading if one intends to paint a comprehensive picture of the reception of a particular work, and for that reason I have chosen to include a focus on commentary alongside works of literary reception of the Tristia which take a more extensive view towards the work, more in line with present day norms of reading.

While tracing the developments within the commentaries on the Tristia, I also situate their evolving emphases amidst the overall development of commentary on Ovid, as well as the Classical scholarship of the era under investigation. The commentators upon which this study focuses were not the most innovative expositors, but their distance from the cutting edge of classical philology makes them all the more interesting and valuable: far from being unique, they serve as evidence for widely accepted norms of reading and interpreting, and thereby may grant us broader access to the ways that ancient literature was consumed and understood. It is here that the secondary scholarship will be of the most use, since while no full-scale studies on the
II. The Poetic Responses

The second half of this project is concerned with poetic responses to Ovid’s exilic works in the Latin poetry of the 16th century. It complements what comes before by presenting a study that is more focused on the extensive reading of the *Tristia* (and to some extent the *Ex Ponto*), by which I mean a reading that is broader in scope and seeks to incorporate the individual units of the text into a coherent whole (say, as a part of an individual poem), which in turn is also viewed as part of a larger poetic corpus (that is, a body of poetry—either contained within a single work or made up of multiple works). As my discussion of the commentaries will show, while the *Tristia* was read as a storehouse of general knowledge of the ancient world and myth, a historical source for the antiquarian reconstruction of ancient places and practices, and as a repository of

---

31 Among the scholars of the Ovidian tradition who have greatly influenced the current study, I number Moss, White, and Fritsen, and Hexter (whom I have mentioned previously), as well as several of the works of Coulson including "Hitherto Unedited Medieval and Renaissance Lives of Ovid (I)." *Mediaeval Studies* 49 (1987) and "Hitherto Unedited Medieval and Renaissance Lives of Ovid (II): Humanistic Lives." *Mediaeval Studies* 59 (1997), as well as "Renaissance Latin Commentaries on the Iudicium armorum." *Studii umanistici Piceni* 30 (2010) and "Ovid's *Metamorphoses* in the School Tradition of France, 1180-1400; Texts, manuscript traditions, manuscript settings," in *Ovid in the Middle Ages*, eds. J. G. Clark, F. T Coulson and K. L. McKinley (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011). Concerning the study of the classical tradition in general, I would be remiss not to mention the broader studies such as the influential work of Anthony Grafton and Lisa Jardine (*From Humanism to the Humanities* (Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 1986) and the masterful monograph of Robert Black (*Humanism and Education in Medieval and Renaissance Italy: Tradition and Innovation in Latin Schools from the Twelfth to the Fifteenth Centuries* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).
rhetorical teaching, the commentaries lack what we would understand as literary critique. There is good reason for this absence, however: in an age (in our case the 16th century) in which the Latin language still exists as a living language and a viable tool for literary production, and is utilized by artists who view themselves as members of a Latin literary tradition stretching back to antiquity, literary critique of Latin poetry belongs by and large to the Latin poets and finds expression in Latin poetry. In this age of antiquarians and travelling intellectuals—the new itinerant sophists—and armchair travelers who bruit themselves abroad through their letters and compositions, who all speak and write in a language which consciously recreates the Latin of Caesar and Cicero while interjecting new forms of expression, and who treat the city of Rome almost as an interactive museum, everyone is in one way or another engaged in receiving his past. Some even display it ostentatiously, pretentiously. This makes for fertile ground for a reception study.

The literary analyses presented in this study address broadly stylistic and thematic influences from the Tristia and Ex Ponto on a select group of postscripts to Ovid’s exilic works, relying on close readings of the Latin texts. More specifically, the analyses investigate the ways in which the Renaissance Latin poets sought to employ and adapt both the Ovidian exilic person and the imaginary created within the exile poems to their own literary purposes and contexts; in effect, they present my reading of their reading of the exilic works.
My selection of Klemens Janicki’s *Tristium Liber* and Joachim du Bellay’s Latin elegies as the foci of these chapters is, admittedly, a subjective choice. A comprehensive survey of Neo-Latin poets of the 16th century who reflect upon, react to, or adapt the exilic Ovid would exceed the scale of the present project.\(^{32}\) To choose only to address poetic responses is to segregate a whole body of prose literature which interacts with the exilic imaginary. It was never my intention to provide such a survey approach to the Renaissance literature, in the belief that far more fruitful outcomes might result from more intensive study of select works.

All works of reception focused upon a single author or work run the risk of over-selectivity, and mine is no exception. This need for selectivity points to a methodological dilemma within literary reception studies that needs to be addressed, however briefly: the problem of the reception of reception. In drawing the boundaries of what is to be included in this study, and choosing to relate these two poets of the 16th century directly to the ancient poet Ovid, I have inevitably left out the discussion of myriad intermediaries through which these Renaissance poets’ readings of Ovid may have been filtered. For instance, how important is the profound influence of Erasmus on Renaissance Poland to Klemens Janicki’s understanding of the *Tristia*, and how much is his reception of

---

\(^{32}\) Indeed, many of the works that I originally intended to address had to be set aside for future study, such as Poliziano’s *De Exilio Ovidii*, Scaliger’s *Letter from Ovid to Augustus*, Tycho Brahe’s exilic elegies, and the works of Elizabeth Weston, one of the few female Neo-Latin poets known to us.
the exilic Ovid a reception of the Erasmian reception?\textsuperscript{33} This question may seem incredibly important to one who is engaged in a work of \textit{Rezeptionsgeschichte} concerned with tracing the development of thought on the \textit{Tristia} from antiquity to the present, and whose primary aim is to perform a sort of intellectual archaeological dig, hoping to strip away the intervening layers of interpretation in order to gaze from their present position into a trench in which antiquity is revealed, free of its centuries of baggage. The fruitful result of such an approach is doubtful; as Charles Martindale has asked, “How could one ever know if one had truly stripped away all the layers of ‘anachronism’ in this process of intellectual ascesis? And, even could one do so, what would be left might turn out to be rather evidently impoverished. If we strip away all the ‘accretions’ we don’t get the ‘original truth’ but something much more insubstantial.”\textsuperscript{34}

This question of intervening accretions presents little trouble, however, for the model of reception utilized by Julia Gaisser, who rightly notes that classical texts “are not teflon-coated baseballs hurtling through time and gazed up at uncomprehendingly by the natives of various times and places, until they reach our enlightened grasp; rather they are pliable and sticky artifacts gripped, molded, and stamped with new meanings by every generation of readers, and

\textsuperscript{33} I only manage to approach this problem in an oblique manner in my chapter on Janicki, due to practical constraints of time and length; nevertheless, the influence of Erasmus looms in the background over all of Polish (if not all late-European) Humanism, and the investigation of Erasmian thought in Janicki’s poetics would likely yield fruitful results.

they come to us irreversibly altered by the experience.”35 Through Gaisser’s lens, there remains no clear distinction between the classical texts themselves and their receptions. This view harmonizes with the Jaussian view championed so effectively by Martindale, which acknowledges a text’s historicity, but also accepts the validity of a reader’s aesthetic response in the present (or any other ‘present’ of reading for that matter).36 My purpose in elucidating these poets’ aesthetic responses to the Tristia is not to identify them so that they may be stripped away; rather, I would have them understood as an interpretation of one particular present of reading, from which we may take freely as we please to enhance our own readings of the Tristia, whether that means a simple coloration or a radical alteration of our present interpretations. In my own experience, reading the poems of both Janicki and Du Bellay, and utilizing their works as an interpretive lens (in an act of ‘backwards’ reading) has opened my eyes to aspects of the exile poetry to which I was not previously attuned.

This idea of backwards reading begs a discussion of the processes by which the unpacking of intertextual allusions, one of this study’s key interpretive

tools, functions. I tend to understand allusion as Craig Kallendorf has sketched it in his useful schematic:

\[\text{text}^1 (T^1) \rightarrow \text{[reading of author (R-A)]} \rightarrow \text{text}^2 (T^2) \rightarrow \text{reading of critic (R-C)}\]

Kallendorf uses this formula to emphasize the fact that there are not one, but two readers operating in allusion: the author of the alluding text \((T^2)\) as a reader \((R-A)\) of the original \((T^1)\), and the critic as reader of the alluding text \((R-C)\). Kallendorf rightfully brackets \(R-A\) as “reconstruction of a reading that is not available in the same way as \(R-C\) is.” In this model, in his or her process of recreating \(R-A\), despite having an original reading of \(T^1\) which was independent of \(T^2\), the reader “generates a reading of \(T^1\) through the filter of \(T^2\).” As far as reading backwards is concerned, Kallendorf has shown elsewhere the validity and usefulness of the idea that meaning may flow in either chronological

---

37 Though verbally enriching \((\text{local})\) allusions remain important, this study focuses more on allusions which are \(\text{systematic}\), that is, the reference will contribute considerably to meaning (see Udo J. Hebel, "Towards a Descriptive Poetics of Allusion." In \textit{Intertextuality} edited by Heinrich F. Plett, 135-46. Berlin-New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1991).


39 “The alluding author begins the process by reading an earlier text, then working out an interpretation of that text. As he or she begins writing, the new text unfolds in dialogue with the old one, in such a way that the potential meaning of one or more words resonates against their original usage in another text, where they meant something that is seen as relevant again. The critic, the second reader, works backwards and recreates this process as he or she is able to understand it, reading the second text and coming to a preliminary idea about what it means; then noticing a relationship to an earlier text that the author could have known, then going back and forth between the two to reconstruct the author’s reading of the first text on the basis of the allusions and what they appear to reveal,” (ibid.).

40 \textit{Ibid.}, 69.

41 \textit{Ibid.}
direction, backwards or forwards, between texts and readings.\textsuperscript{42} I present this methodological schema simply to acknowledge that my reconstructions of both Janicki’s and Du Bellay’s readings are just that: reconstructions, contingent upon my provisional understanding of both the \textit{Tristia} (my T\textsuperscript{1}) and the elegiac Latin postscripts of the 16\textsuperscript{th} century (my T\textsuperscript{2}). Furthermore, such a theoretical framework can elucidate the way in which I believe that my own study of these postscripts may benefit the present day reader of Ovid’s \textit{Tristia}.

\textit{Similar studies}\textsuperscript{43}

Though both Janicki’s \textit{Tristium Liber} and du Bellay’s Latin elegies remain in relative obscurity, the study of Ovid’s \textit{Tristia} in relation to Neo-Latin poetry of the 16\textsuperscript{th} century is not entirely without precedent. Siegmar Döpp (1998b) published an article on the Alsatian humanist Iohannes Fabricius Montanus (1527-1566), focused on his production of two autobiographical epistles, one in

\textsuperscript{42} Craig Kallendorf, ”Philology, the Reader, and the Nachleben of Classical Texts,” \textit{Modem Philology} 92 (1994): 137-156.

\textsuperscript{43} I have restricted discussion which follows to authors who specifically deal with Ovid and the \textit{Tristia} in relation to 16\textsuperscript{th}-century poets. I must mention, however, several formative and influential studies that treat the reception of the Latin classics in later authors (Latin and otherwise), from which my own study has benefitted, albeit indirectly. These include Julia Haig Gaisser, \textit{Catullus and his Renaissance Readers} (Oxford: Clarendon, 1993); Theodore Ziolkowski, \textit{Ovid and the Moderns} (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2005); Andrew Laird, \textit{The Epic of America: An Introduction to Rafael Landívar and the Rusticatio Mexicana} (London: Duckworth, 2006); Craig Kallendorf, \textit{The Vergilian Tradition: Book History and the History of Reading in Early Modern Europe} (Aldershot [UK]-Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2007) and \textit{The Other Virgil: ‘Pessimistic’ Readings of the Aeneid in Early Modern Culture} (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007); Jan Ziolkowski and Michael C. J. Putnam, eds., \textit{The Vergilian Tradition: the First Fifteen Hundred Years} (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008). The works of Gaisser, Laird, and Kallendorf in particular represent a rousing call-to-arms for further study of Neo-Latin.
prose, the other in elegiacs. Döpp touches only tangentially on Ovid’s *Tristia*, but clearly cites poem 4.10 as the primary influence on the autobiographical sub-genre of elegy which grew popular among the Latin poets of the mid-16th century, Janicki and du Bellay included. Montanus and *Tr. 4.10* would later receive a more direct treatment in the article of David Amherdt (2006), which marks the beginning of a clustered group of publications on the subject of Neo-Latin poetic autobiography and the *Tristia*. The first of these is the monograph of Raimund Johann Weinczyk (2008) which presents an intensely focused study of the poetic ‘Letter to Posterity’ (‘*Eobanus posteritati*’) of the Hessian Helius Eobanus Hessus (1488-1540); over the course of 160 pages, Weinczyk performs an intensive linguistic analysis of a mere fifteen of the poems seventy-six couplets, and his model for studying the text largely eschews broader contexts. Shortly after, Karine Descoings (2009) published a survey article on the reception and imitation of *Tr. 4.10* in Renaissance Neo-Latin beginning from Petrarch and

---


45 This cluster of studies is more than a generation removed from the work of IJsewijn ("Humanistic autobiography," *Studia humanitatis. Ernesto Grassi zum 70.Geburtstag*, eds. E. Hora and E. Kessler, 208-219 (München: W. Fink, 1973)), which treated the more general aspects of humanistic autobiography; more recently, a comprehensive treatment of the whole topic has been attempted by K.A. E. Eiken, *Die Erfindung des Menschen, die Autobiographik des frühneuzeitlichen Humanismus von Petrarca bis Lipsius* (Berlin-New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2008).

Boccaccio. Descoings’ doctoral thesis (2007) also deals with the reception of Ovid’s exile elegies, in this case among the works of one of 16th-century Germany’s most famous Latin poets, Petrus Lotichius Secundus.47

III. The contents

Chapter 2 provides a detailed introduction to the three major commentaries on Ovid’s Tristia that circulated in the 16th century, beginning from the first printed commentary, that of Merula, in 1499. The chapter is prefaced with a brief introduction to the medieval commentary tradition out of which the Renaissance commentaries grew; periodic references back to these medieval comparanda throughout the exploration of the Renaissance commentaries demonstrate that, despite a general perception of novelty, the Renaissance commentaries in many ways represented a continuance of tradition rather than a break with it. Each commentator receives a brief biographical sketch to provide context, and their respective commentaries are evaluated

47 Lotichius works may be of interest to scholars of the Protestant Reformation, as he studied in with both Philip Melanchthon and Joachim Camerarius at Wittenberg and Leipzig, respectively. He was reputedly (per the ADB) inspired to write poetry by Jacobus Micyllus, who wrote commentaries on several of Ovid’s works. Lotichius’s place in the elegiac tradition is discussed in the collected essays contained in U. Auhagen and E. Schäfer, eds., Lotichius und die römische Elegie (Tübingen: Narr, 2001). The best place for the texts of Lotichius’s poetry still remains the 1754 edition of Pieter Burman. It is worth noting that the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek has digitized a copy of the 1594 printing of his Opera Omnia. A more recent edition of Book 1 of his elegies exists with translation and commentary in Katherine Fraiman, "Petrus Lotichius Secundus Elegiarum Liber Primus Edited with an Introduction, Translation, and Commentary," (PhD diss., Columbia University, 1973); a literary biography of Lotichius is the topic of Stephen Zon, "Petrus Lotichius Secundus (1528-1560), Neo-Latin Poet (Germany)" (PhD diss., University of California-Santa Barbara, 1983).
broadly by a number of criteria with relevant textual examples. It presents a trajectory for commentary on the Tristia in the 16th century that moves from encyclopedism, to rhetorically focused commentary, to text-critical and comparative commentary.

Chapter 3 builds from the groundwork laid by Chapter 2 by providing a more focused analysis of the three commentaries at work, centered on a single section of the Tristia, namely Book 2. The chapter examines instances in which the commentators expound upon the same sections of the text, the sharing of lemmata, as well as agreements and disagreements between commentators in order to demonstrate more clearly the concepts outlined in the previous chapter.

Chapter 4 presents the first of two case studies in the literary reception of the exilic works. It treats the Polish poet laureate Klemens Janicki and his book of elegies provocatively entitled Tristium Liber. Despite the fact that he is considered the pinnacle of Polish achievement in Latin letters, the major studies, editions, and commentaries on his poetry exist only in Polish, rendering this inspired and highly original Neo-Latin poet unknown to wider audiences. The entirety of his work remains without an English translation, and therefore much of the material that I have reproduced represents its first publication in English. Due to Janicki’s relative obscurity, the chapter provides a biographical section before elaborating the literary process by which his adaptation of Ovid functions. It focuses on how Janicki—who acknowledges that he is no political exile—assumes the Ovidian
exilic persona as a tool for ethical and political critiques. Throughout my readings of the elegies of the Tristium Liber, I argue that Janicki seeks to rehabilitate the Ovidian exilic voice by reintroducing its ideas concerning the importance of literary cultivation (cultus) and proper personal and professional relations among learned friends and patrons (amicitia) into his contemporary cultural discourse, thereby restoring it to efficacy in the moral and political spheres.

The subject of Chapter 5, the second literary case study, is Joachim du Bellay, well-known for his collection of French sonnets, Les Regrets. This section, however, investigates his much less well-known Latin elegies published in 1558 after returning from Rome. It examines the Tristia as nostalgic poetry, and demonstrates how du Bellay employs Ovid’s exilic persona not simply as a means to express his displeasure at his separation from his homeland, but primarily as a tool with which to explore the idealization and privileging of the physical site of Rome and to establish himself in the aesthetic space of nostalgia created by Ovid in the Tristia and Ex Ponto. The continued development of this unique nostalgic space for his own literary production aids in the development of an autonomous poetic identity that is inspired by the ancients, but free from the shackles of an imitative poetics.

CHAPTER 2: RENAISSANCE COMMENTARIES ON OVID’S TRISTIA

I. Introduction

The men who wrote the major Renaissance commentaries on Ovid’s Tristia were neither the most famous, nor the most accomplished humanist scholars of their era; their scholarly lives lack the glamour of high-powered intellectualism and none of them left a lasting mark on the philological discipline. These were no Polizianos or Scaligers: a fact which has no doubt contributed to the lack of attention that these texts have received. This chapter seeks to grant to the Tristia commentaries of these three men—Bartholomaeus Merula, Vitus Amerbach, and Hercules Ciofanus—the attention that they deserve by offering an introduction to their respective commentaries and exegetical methods. This detailed overview will be followed (in the subsequent chapter) by a side-by-side analysis of their comments on Book 2 of the Tristia.

Merula, though he was a contemporary of Poliziano, possessed a method and style undeniably different from that of the greatest humanists of the late Quattrocento, whose novel historical approaches to philology would eventually overshadow the work of more traditional thinkers and come to define the
intellectual climate of the era. Nevertheless, Merula’s edition with commentary of the *Tristia* loomed large over the whole tradition of the text throughout the 16th century, exerting its influence upon the scholars who would follow him in examining Ovid’s exile elegies. Merula was a practitioner of the encyclopedic approach to textual commentary, amassing large amounts of information about ancient culture and literature from a vast pool of sources with little discrimination, while offering grammatical clarification. Vitus Amerbach, the author of the subsequent *Tristia* commentary, is likewise largely unconcerned with making philological judgments about the text, preferring to offer aid to the reader in matters of rhetorical style along with analysis of Ovid’s suasive techniques. Ciofanus, the last of the commentators examined in this chapter, was devoted to constructing a reliable text of the *Tristia* and offers a more synoptic and comparative view of its elegies by relating them to Ovid’s other works. The traditional approaches of these three scholars therefore preclude their commentaries from being discussed in the context of the great and innovative philological strides made by the monumental figures of humanism from Poliziano onwards; yet, the time span between their respective publication dates (Merula in 1499, Amerbach in 1553, and Ciofanus in 1580) allows one to use these commentaries to demonstrate the general trajectory of the development of the

---


50 This is elaborated below in section 1a.
methods adopted by commentators on the Latin classics in the 16th century. The following analysis is concerned mostly with the reception of these texts, i.e. why they were valued by their readers (and can still be valued by us moderns) and what their methods can tell us about how the *Tristia* was read by both students and scholars.

*The Medieval Backdrop*

Before examining these three Renaissance commentaries in detail, however, it will be useful to survey the medieval commentary tradition on Ovid’s exile poems both for the sake of context and due to the fact they, too, have received relatively little scholarly attention. The Renaissance commentaries on the *Tristia* did not emerge from a vacuum; rather, they are a single point in the evolution of a tradition of commentary that stretches back to the 1100s.

---

51 The details of this section are deeply indebted to Alton and Wormell’s work on Ovid in the context of medieval schools. Hexter (*Ovid and Medieval Schooling*) has made a cursory study of the medieval *accessus* to the *Tristia* in their connection with the commentary tradition of the *Epistulae ex Ponto*, which is his primary focus. The best resource for finding and tracing the manuscripts of the medieval commentaries on any of Ovid’s works is the indispensable work of Frank T. Coulson and Bruno Roy, *Incipitarium Ovidianum: A finding guide for texts related to the study of Ovid in the Middle Ages and Renaissance* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2000), together with published updates in Frank Coulson, "Addenda and Corrigenda to Incipitarium Ovidianum," *Journal of Medieval Latin* 12 (2002) and "Addenda and Corrigenda to Incipitarium Ovidianum II," *Journal of Medieval Latin* 20 (2010).

52 Francesco lo Monaco (“Alcune osservazioni sui commenti umanistici ai classici nel secondo Quattrocento,” in *Il Commento ai testi*, 127) highlights the importance of studying the medieval roots of Renaissance commentaries, asserting that “[la] questione del rapporto tra commento medioevale e commento umanistico...non ha ancora ricevuta l’attenzione che merita” (“the question of the relationship between medieval and humanistic commentary has...not received the attention it deserves”).
Ovid’s works, unfortunately, did not benefit from a collection of late antique commentaries, in the manner of Vergil, Lucan, or Statius. Extant manuscript evidence and the dearth of Ovidian testimonia in the grammarians imply that Ovidian works were not the object of intense study in the period between classical antiquity and the Middle Ages. As so often seems to be the case with Ovid (and the exile poems especially), the impact of his poetry was delayed, and his works were forced to wait out the long centuries before exacting their transformative effects upon the scholarly scene in the late 11th century. As E. H. Alton put it, suddenly “the black sheep of Augustus became the white-headed boy of the schoolmaster.” The rapidly burgeoning influence of Ovid in this period (measured by the proliferation of manuscripts, production of manuscr

---

53 The only certain citation of the Tristia in the Latin grammarians comes from a treatise on metrics (De re metrica, c.4th c. C.E.) written under the name of Atilius Fortunatianus (see Heinrich Keil, Grammatici Latini VI (Leipzig: Teubner, 1874). Hexter (Ovid and Medieval Schooling, 7) also points out the result of this lack of antique commentary: “when, for whatever reason, there was a sudden surge of interest in reading and studying Ovid, medieval schoolmasters seem to have had no ancient commentaries on Ovid on which to draw. They were forced to make new assemblages and for this reason the commentaries on Ovid, beyond telling us quite explicitly at least some of what was thought and said when an ancient author was read and studied, may be of particular interest to modern scholars.”

54 “Ovid in the Medieval Schoolroom (I),” 26.

commentaries, and presence in the school curriculum)\(^{56}\) led Ludwig Traube to proclaim it the \textit{aetas Ovidiana}.\(^{57}\) One of the key locations for this development was the cathedral schools of the \textit{Orléanais}, led by their masters, Arnulf, William, and Fulco.\(^{58}\) The first two hold importance for the tradition of the \textit{Tristia}.

Arnulf of Orléans wrote his commentaries in the latter part of the 12\(^{th}\) century, and all but one of them had Ovidian works as their subject matter; he glossed the \textit{Ars}, \textit{Remedia}, \textit{Fasti}, \textit{Ex Ponto}, and penned two works on the \textit{Metamorphoses} (a commentary and collection of allegories of the transformations).\(^{59}\) A commentary on the \textit{Tristia} and an \textit{accessus} which have been


\(^{57}\) Ludwig Traube, “Die lateinische Sprache des Mittelalters,” in \textit{Vorlesungen und Abhandlungen, II}, ed. Ludwig Traube (Munchen: C. H. Beck, 1911). This chronology, of course, should only be understood as a generalization. We know well that Ovid was studied in earlier ages, despite the prominence of Vergil and Horace; we see his influence in Carolingian poets like Modoin of Autun and Theodulf of Orléans, and the oldest extant manuscripts of Ovid date, by and large, to the Carolingian period.

\(^{58}\) For a detailed account of these masters and relevant bibliography, as well as discussion of the school tradition of the \textit{Metamorphoses} in medieval France traced through these men, see Engelbrecht, “\textit{Carmina Pieridum}” and “Fulco, Arnulf, and William”; see also Frank T. Coulson, “Ovid’s Transformation in Medieval France, c. 1100-c. 1350,” in \textit{Metamorphosis. The Changing face of Ovid in Medieval and Early Modern Europe}, eds. Alison Keith and Stephen Rupp (Toronto: Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies, 2007) and Coulson, “School Tradition of France.”

\(^{59}\) A critical edition and study of Arnulf’s philological commentary on the \textit{Metamorphoses} has been completed recently in David T. Gura, "A critical edition and study of Arnulf of Orléans' philological commentary to Ovid's \textit{Metamorphoses}," (PhD diss., The Ohio State University, 2010). The sole extant commentary which was not on an Ovidian work is on Lucan’s \textit{Bellum Civile}, an edition of which was completed by Berthe Marti, \textit{Arnulfi Aurelianensis glosule super Lucanum}, (Rome: American Academy in Rome, 1958).
speculatively attributed to Arnulf exists in two manuscripts. In the Cambridge manuscript, there are actually two different commentaries, and it is unlikely that Arnulf is the author of both. Folios 1r-2r contain a brief accessus and a short commentary on Books 1 and 2 of the Tristia. At the middle of the second column on folio 2r, a second, different commentary begins (in a new hand) from the opening of Book 2. This commentary continues until the last folio, and covers through the end of the Tristia.

On preliminary investigation, both of these commentaries are similarly concerned with the readability of the poems, and their catena formats place them soundly in a schoolroom setting. The great majority of their glosses are of the

---

60 These are Cambridge, University Library, Add. 4456 (formerly Phillipps 11068), ff. 1r-8v (formerly 103r-110v), which is dated to the end of the 12th century and Antwerp, Musaeum Plantin-Moretus, M. 85 (lat. 71), f. 42r-v, which is from the 13th century. There is reason to doubt the attribution of this commentary to Arnulf. This is not the place for a detailed investigation of the commentary, but suffice it to say that there are two major causes for this doubt. First, the accessus to the Tristia commentary, when compared with Arnulf’s commentary on the Ex Ponto, omits several things. In the Ex Ponto accessus, Arnulf posits the standard three causes of Ovid’s exile, while the accessus to the Tristia only mentions the possibility of Ovid having an affair with Livia and his writing about her in the guise of Corinna. Furthermore, in its discussion of the difference between relegation and exile, it omits proscriptio and inscriptio from the catalog possible punishments for Ovid. The second stumbling block is that the commentary to the Tristia has no inscription. Arnulf had a notoriously large ego and signed his commentaries to ensure that the user would know they were reading the glosses of the famous Arnulf. Admittedly, the signature could have been omitted by a copying scribe, but those in possession of the commentary would be unlikely to leave it out in reproduction, as there is a great deal of prestige attached to having a copy of a famous master’s commentary on a particular work in your library.

61 This is hereafter referred to as ‘Arnulf 1’.

62 This is hereafter referred to as ‘Arnulf 2’.

63 The exact definition of the catena, offered by John Ward (“From Marginal Gloss to Catena Commentary: The Eleventh-Century Origins of a Rhetorical Teaching Tradition in the Medieval West,” Parergon 13 (1996), 109) is as follows: “The catena gloss contains, not the text being glossed, but only key-words abstracted from that text, each of these being followed by the glosses on it. The resultant text, made up of these ‘key-words’ inserted into the gloss, like links in a chain, looks like a new continuous prose work which completely replaces the original.” The catena is
‗id est‘ variety: they either provide synonyms, offer easier renderings of a particular phrase or construction, or explain what Ovid means. Occasional informative glosses provide mythological, cultural, or historical tidbits, such as the brief explanation of the wound of Telephus on f. 2r (in ‘Arnulf 2‘ on Tr. 2) or the small note on the ludi saeculares and Horace’s Carmen Saeculare, prompted by Ovid’s mention of the games of Apollo put on by Augustus. None of these notes constitutes a full digression away from the text, and none of them is very long. These commentaries put all of their efforts into helping the student read and understand Ovid’s Latin. There appears to be no attempt at any sort of allegorization (usually a characteristic feature of Arnulf’s glosses).

William of Orléans (fl. 1200) belongs to the generation after Arnulf, and was the author of the most widely circulated commentary on the Tristia from the associated with an oral lecture format: Ward sees their production as an effort to meet the needs of students for their masters’ glosses. Such a demand suggests an institutionalization of teaching classical authors in the late 11th and 12th centuries. Their popularity dwindled in 13th, as the scholion (text/gloss) format became the overwhelmingly dominant style as the teaching of Dialectic spread outward from its center at the Sorbonne, resulting in a curriculum that neglected the use of classical authors for the instruction of grammar. There was, however, a revival of the catena commentary that coincided with the humanist rediscovery of classical texts (and not to mention their renewed interest in the said 12th-century commentaries). On the survival and revival of the catena in the Renaissance, see both Frank T. Coulson, “The Catena Commentary and Its Renaissance Progeny,” Manuscripta 54 (2010) and David T. Gura, “From the Orleanais to Pistoia: The Survival of the Catena Commentary,” Manuscripta 54 (2010).

Gernot Wieland has produced in-depth studies of the varying types of glosses produced by medieval commentators in both The Latin Glosses on Arator and Prudentius in Cambridge, University Library, Ms Gg.5.35 (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1983) and "Interpreting the Interpretation: The Polysemy of the Latin Gloss," Journal of Mediaeval Latin 8 (1998).

This is unlike Arnulf as well. For an example of Arnulf’s use of digression (in his commentary on the Fasti), see Fritsen, “Ovid’s Fasti,” 34-5.

This is, of course, only a preliminary finding. A closer investigation of the text is necessary before anything about it can be said conclusively. It is likely that the lack of allegory is due to the fact that the Tristia were thought unsuitable for allegorical analysis, as their medieval readers believed the events depicted within the poems to be historical and biographical.
medieval period. His is the only medieval commentary on the *Tristia* which has been fully edited and received recent attention. The glosses on the *Tristia* are contained within William’s *catena* commentary on the whole of Ovid’s poetic corpus known as the *Versus bursarii*. William’s glosses are similar in style and purpose to those contained in the ‘Arnulf’ commentaries: once again the target audience is the elementary Latin student, and once again there is a drive for clarification of the meaning of the Latin. William focuses intensely on difficult and ambiguous passages, which may be the origin of the term *bursarius* used in the title—he opens the many pockets and folds of Ovid’s poems. A great many of his glosses begin with either *continua* or *continua et construe*. The schools of Orléans had not yet fallen under the sway of new Scholastic grammar methods, and William’s approach to the subject is traditional, seemingly based on the older approaches of Priscian and Donatus. Alton rightly assesses William in claiming that “his determination to discover the proper sequence of thought and construction...is highly commendable, though sometimes in this regard his zeal outruns his discretion.”

William is interested in the precise meanings of words, particularly when it comes to distinguishing between two similar words that may be easily

---

67 The current authority on William’s *Versus bursarii* is Engelbrecht (*De Bursarii super Ovidios*), whose edition comes complete with detailed information about William’s commentary style and his influences.
69 Alton, "Ovid in the Medieval Schoolroom (II)," 68.
This reflects the scholarly milieu of William’s day, as this interest is reflected in the work of Eberhard of Béthune, whose popular hexametrical Latin textbook, the Graecismus (c. 1212), contained a whole chapter on this subject. William’s commentary contains four lines of hexameter describing the difference between the various types of exile (which presumably were easily mistaken, prompting the need for such a verse), which are also found in the Graecismus. The fact that William and Eberhard were contemporaries, however, makes determining which way the influence flowed difficult.

William’s commentary also avoids allegorizations and retains its philological approach throughout. He, too, is reluctant to undertake significant digressions, and seems less willing than even the authors of the ‘Arnulf’ commentaries to give any cultural or historical information. Moreover, the

---

70 Take for example, his note on Tr. 1.9.63, explaining the difference between defendere and excusare: Hoc interest inter excusare et defendere, quod defendere est omnino denegare, excusare confiteri scilicet carmen pretendere, quia vero peccatum Ovidii notum erat pluribus. Dicit quod non potest defendi, sed excusari (“The difference between ‘to excuse’ and ‘to defend’ is that ‘to defend’ is to deny entirely, ‘to excuse’ is to confess, meaning here to offer up his song, since Ovid’s wrong-doing was known to many. He says he is able not to defend himself, but to excuse himself”). All texts of William’s commentary come from Engelbrecht, De Bursarii super Ovidios (vol. 2).

71 The verses appear in William’s note on Tr. 2.137, and in the Graecismus (in a slightly altered order) as vv. 223-6 of Ch. 13 in the edition of J. Wrobel, Eberhardi Bethuniensis Graecismus (Oxford: G. Köbneri, 1887). The impetus behind the mnemonic is the same as the comment cited above (n. 21): to distinguish precisely between words with similar meanings. In William, the comment reads: Hoc interest inter relegatum et exulem et inscriptum et proscriptum: Exul abit sine spe patrie reditusque reique, / quisque relegatus sua, cum remeabit, habebit. / Amittit proscriptus opes nec posse reverti. / Inscription manet in patria sed re spoliatus (“The difference between one who is relegated and an exile and an inscribed person and proscribed person is: The exile departs without hope of return of his homeland or property, and one who is relegated will receive his when he will return. The proscribed man loses his wealth, nor can it be regained, the inscribed man stays in his country, but deprived of his property”). Hexter (Ovid and Medieval Schooling, 104-106) discusses the importance of this mnemonic in the school tradition of the Ex Ponto, since a version of it is also to be found in an early 13th-century accessus to that work (in München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, MS CLM 14753).
comments on the *Tristia* within the *Versus bursarii* are much less extensive than those of the ‘Arnulf’ commentaries, and William displays much more selectivity in what he chooses to gloss.\(^{72}\)

These commentaries on the *Tristia* (as well as some anonymous ones) continue to circulate in anthology form during the 13\(^{th}\) century. The ‘Arnulf’ commentary can be found anthologized in Antwerp, Musaeum Plantin Moretus, MS M 85; William’s glosses in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Canon. class. lat. MS 1; and an anonymous commentary in Copenhagen, Kongelige Bibliotek, Fabricius MS 29 2\(^o\).\(^{73}\)

Worth mentioning as well is a little investigated and quite lengthy *scholion* commentary contained in Kiel, Universitätsbibliothek, K. B. 40, ff. 1r-50v which dates to the 13\(^{th}\) century. The manuscript appears, by both script and provenance, to have been produced in central France. An inscription at the beginning of the work proclaims “*pertinet iste liber ovidii de tristibus collegio bonorum virorum iuxta portam sancti victoris*” (“this book, Ovid’s *de Tristibus*, belongs to the college of the good men at Saint Victor”), which would place the manuscript in Paris.\(^{74}\) It was originally produced as a text of Ovid’s poem with

\(^{72}\) For example, his commentary on *Tr*.2 contains glosses on only 75 lines out of a possible 579.


\(^{74}\) According to a later inscription in French, the manuscript came into the hands of the Madame de Combronde and de Saint-Ilpize, in Auvergne, before coming to Kiel.
interlinear glosses, but over time the manuscript accumulated marginal notes from a number of hands (at least four). One of these hands produces a continuous commentary that runs throughout the whole of the work, while the others supply notes only in select places. Each individual elegy is provided with a brief argumentum describing its contents. The continuous commentary belongs principally to the ‘id est’ variety, offering rephrases and explanations of Ovid’s meaning, though there is a keen interest in mythology, as proper names of mythological figures (like Palamedes, Telegonus, or Pylades) receive longer notes that detail their respective stories. A fuller analysis of the whole of the commentary in terms of content and grammatical method will yield, I suspect, many differences from the commentaries of the Orléanais, due to the philosophical differences between the schools of Paris and Orléans, as well as the emergence of Modist grammar theory in the late-twelfth and early-thirteenth centuries. An accessus (a bit of a misnomer, in this case) is appended to the end of the text, which, despite its odd placement on the final folio at the end of Book 5, still retains its introduction to the first poem of the work.

75 We even know the name of the original scribe, recorded in a colophon: a certain Guillermus Rosti (an Italian surname).
76 This accessus may also be found in Gotha, Forschungs- und Landesbibliothek, Membr. II. 122, fol. 33v (13th c.), an edition of which is provided by Gustav Przychocki, Accessus Ovidiani. Symbolae ad Veterum Auctorum Historiam atque ad Medii Aevi Studia Philologa 1 (Kraków, 1911), 99-100. See Coulson and Roy, Incipitarium, 200: no. 174.
II. The Renaissance Commentaries

1. Bartholomaeus Merula

The first printed commentary on Ovid’s *Tristia* was written by the learned and prolific Bartholomaeus Merula [Bartolomeo Merlano], and was published in Venice in 1499 by the press of Ioannes Tacuinus [Giovanni da Cerreto]. The commentary was composed to accompany his new edition of the *Tristia*, the first to be produced since the printing of the *editiones principes* at Rome and Bologna in 1471.

Despite Merula’s reputation as an erudite commentator and a useful editor, the details of his life have remained in relative obscurity. His story must be reconstructed piecemeal from the bits of information that can be extracted from the nuncupatory epistles which accompany his various works. He was to attain his greatest success in Venice, but his origins are uncertain: he was born sometime in the middle of the 15th century, possibly at Mantua. Education seems to have been a family enterprise, and it is possible that he was in some way

---

77 S. G. Owen (*Tristium Liber II*, 85), in his survey of the previous editions and commentaries in his commentary on *Tristia* 2, writes of Merula, “As regards the interpretation of the *Tristia*, the earliest and still one of the most useful editions is that of Bartholomaeus Merula, a scholar of fine taste and profound learning.”

78 This can be gleaned from the information in the dedicatory letter to his edition of the *Fasti* (1497, Tacuinus), which is addressed to his brother Alexander, who apparently was also employed as a tutor.
related to the irascible humanist Georgius Merula [Giorgio Merlano] who
dwelled in Venice from 1465-1482.\textsuperscript{79}

Merula taught grammar in Split for a time in the 1470’s,\textsuperscript{80} likely up until
he attained the post that would provide for him for the rest of his life: in 1484,
Cavaliere Giorgio Cornaro,\textsuperscript{81} Venetian merchant prince and brother to the Queen
of Cyprus, sought out a tutor for his sons and Merula was the eventual choice.\textsuperscript{82}
Naturally, such a prestigious placement brought with it new academic \textit{auctoritas},
and it was not long before Merula had embarked upon a programme of editions
and commentaries, all of which Tacuinus would publish.\textsuperscript{83} Though he produced

\textsuperscript{79} Georgius was certainly the more well-known Merula, famous for his quarrel with Poliziano
over the contents of the latter’s \textit{Miscellanea}, amongst other things (see Marco Santoro, \textit{La Polemica
\textsuperscript{80} See A. Praga, "Maestri a Spalato nel Quattrocento." \textit{Annuario del R. Istituto tecnico} 7 (1933).
There also exists a poem written by Merula addressed to one of his colleagues at Split, the native
Croatian humanist and poet Marko Marulić who was central figure of the local humanist circle. It
is reproduced with full citations in Leo Košuta, "Novi Documenti o Djelima Marka Marulica,"
\textsuperscript{81} He is also sometimes called ‘Zorzi Corner’.
\textsuperscript{82} Involved in the hiring process and eventual selection were the renowned Ermolao Barbaro and
Gerolamo Donato, as is evidenced by an extant letter (see Victor Branca, ed., \textit{Ermolao Barbaro.
Epistolae, Orationes et Carmina} (Florence: Bibliopolis, 1943), epistle xli, vol. 1, 56-7; also Martin
Lowry, \textit{The World of Aldus Manutius} (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1979), 185-6.)
\textsuperscript{83} Merula’s editions and/or commentaries (either his own or of others) are as follows: \textit{Ovidius de
arte amandi et de remedio amoris cum commento} (1494); \textit{Q. Curtii De rebus gestis Alexandri Magni regis
Macedonum liber tertius} (1494); \textit{Satyrae} (i.e. Persius, 1494/5, with the commentaries of Ioannes
Brittanicus and Bartholomaeus Fontius); \textit{Bibliotheceae historicae libri VI} (i.e. Diodorus Siculus, 1496);
\textit{Ovidius de Fastis cum duobus commentariis} (1497, with the commentaries of Antonius Constantius
and Paulus Marsus); \textit{Ovidius De Tristibus cum commento} (1499); and \textit{Publii Ovidii Nasonis Libri de
Ponto} (1507). As one may see, Merula edited and commented upon nearly all of the major works
of Ovid, excepting the \textit{Amores} and \textit{Metamorphoses}. Regarding the \textit{Metamorphoses}, however, Merula
is not unpublished: in 1492, Merula ‘acquired’ a copy of the commentary of Raphael Regius,
claiming that some ‘great men’ had been so kind as to gift him with it. Merula did the only thing
that a self-respecting humanist in the cutthroat world of early publishing could have done: he
published it, with his own introductory remarks, before Regius could (\textit{Metamorphoses}, 1493,
printed at Venice by Bonetus Locatellus for Octavianus Scottus). Merula was not so dastardly as
to claim that the work was his own, however, and he graciously allowed Regius’ name to remain
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works on other authors, his primary interest was editing and commenting on Ovid. His commentaries are ostensibly meant to be employed as teaching tools for younger students; their contents reflect the lecture material he used for instructing the young Cornaro aristocrats in Latin letters, and as we shall see, myriad other subjects as well. Merula’s instruction, it appears, was well appreciated by at least one of his charges: when Marco Cornaro was created Cardinal deacon in 1500 at the tender age of 17, he took his tutor with him as his personal secretary—a position which eventually earned Merula the post of apostolic protonotary.

1a. Commentary and method

Marco Cornaro is the addressee of the dedicatory letter which accompanies Merula’s Tristia commentary as a preface to the work. Though it is cut from the common cloth of late 15th-century dedicatory material, it nevertheless reveals many of Merula’s attitudes towards commentary and poetry in general.\(^84\) Conspicuously absent from this preface are any details of Ovid’s life in the title to the edition. Regius would later publish his work himself, and it would go on to become the most frequently printed edition of the _Met._ in the Renaissance.

\(^{84}\) Whether these attitudes are actually employed within the commentary is a point for further discussion, addressed below. On the disjunction between humanist educational claims and humanist educational reality, see Grafton and Jardine, _Humanism_. The importance of the introductory material attached to a particular work (or collection) is well recognized by those who study the medieval commentaries; Hexter (Ovid and Medieval Schooling, 100) asserts that such material (speaking specifically about the _accessus_) “can be profitably examined for the particular information imparted to students about that work, an examination likely to provide further insights into the historical and cultural concerns of medieval educators as well as their
and, perhaps even more surprisingly, considering the contents of the book, any mention of the circumstance which led to Ovid’s exile. This represents a clear departure from tradition, as both these subjects were standard material of the medieval *accessus*. When the subject of the cause for Ovid’s relegation does come up within the commentary itself (at f. 7r, marked by the finding aid ‘Relegationis ovidii causa’), the salacious speculations of prior generations are absent. There he writes, “There are those who surmise that he was relegated because he imprudently looked upon Augustus committing incest with his daughter Julia. Suetonius in ‘Caligula’ writes thus: ‘He proclaimed that his mother was born of the incest which Augustus committed with his daughter Julia.’ Neither the poem of Sidonius, nor the varied opinions of others escape my notice. I assert that nothing certain is able to be brought forth from Ovid’s poems except that he rashly saw something on account of which Augustus, offended,

---

85 There is no *vita* which accompanies the text. It is possible that Merula was content in the fact that in his edition of the *Fasti*, which contained the commentary of Constantius and Marsus and was published two years earlier, he had reproduced Marsus’s life of Ovid. It deals with the various theories of the cause of Ovid’s banishment in some detail.

86 Hexter (*Ovid and Medieval Schooling*, 102) makes it clear that the examination of the question of Ovid’s exile “was a formal part of the student’s study of the work,” as the medieval *accessus* often lays out a methodical process for its investigation. For an example, see the relevant portion of the *accessus* to the *Tristia* edited by R. B. C. Huygens, *Accessus ad auctores*, Bernard d’Utrecht, Conrad d’Hirsau ‘Dialogus super Auctores’ (Leiden: Brill, 1970), 35-36. The medieval *accessus* generally provides the student with the current *status quaestionis* regarding the proposed solutions to the question of why Ovid was exiled, but does not provide the arguments which produced them.

87 The ‘familiar trio’ as Hexter (*Ovid and Medieval Schooling*, 125) calls them, are 1) Ovid saw Augustus and Julia committing incest; 2) he saw Augustus in bed with a boyfriend; 3) he himself slept with Livia and/or wrote about her in the *Amores*, disguised under the pseudonym Corinna.
relegated him.”

Merula also deviates from the medieval tradition in his decision not to include a full discussion of the four types of punishments Ovid faced and their respective legal statuses: proscription, inscription, exile, and relegation. Despite leaving this out of his introductory materials, he does briefly mention, in his comments on Book 2 (f. 19v), the difference between exile and relegation: Differtque exilium a relegatione quod Exilium est perpetuum ("Exile differs from relegation in that exile is forever").

Merula goes a step beyond his medieval forebears in outlining two different sorts of relegation: relegation to an island and prohibition of entering the provinces.

To return to the prefatory letter, Merula begins it with a defense of poetry:

sunt qui hoc nostro aevo tanquam rem [i.e. poeticam facultatem] exilem, aridam, conscissam, minutam, et abiectam aspernentur censeantque non modo non legendos poetas esse, sed ne attingendos quum praesertim ad solutae orationis huberius (ut dicitur) filum deducendum eos dicant nihil omnino nobis

---

88 Merula even reiterates this mention of Suetonius and others in a note at the bottom of f. 19r. Once again he asserts his position: Ego tamen ut hac in re non meam obstringam fidem, sic affirmare ausim (ut etiam diximus) poetam vidisse aliquid agentem Augustum, quo in eius odium pervenit ("Nevertheless I, even if I withhold my trust in this matter [i.e. the incest], I would thus dare to affirm (as I have said already) that the poet saw Augustus doing something by which he fell afoul of him").

89 Hexter (Ovid and Medieval Schooling, 103-105) has shown that instructing the student in these differences was a common trait of the medieval accessus.

90 His distinction between the two follows two verses from the four-verse hexametrical mnemonic from William’s commentary (discussed above). The presence of these verses in Eberhard of Béthune’s Graecismus, one of the most widely used and circulated Latin school texts of the high Middle Ages, makes it fairly certain that Merula was aware of them. Merula seems to prove in part Hexter’s (Ovid and Medieval Schooling, 103) hypothesis, at least in this one case, that a closer examination of much later commentaries would reveal that they had drawn upon and in some fashion reused much of the information from the medieval accessus.

91 f. 19v. Quidam enim in insulam relegatur, quidam simpliciter ut provinciis eis interdicatur ("Certain people were relegated to an island; certain others simply so that they were barred from the provinces"). His source on this is the Digest (it is a paraphrase of 48.22.14, which he cites as Callistatus), which does not seem to have been a source for the medieval accessus.
There are men of our age who would spurn it [i.e. poetic ability] as if it were a meager, shriveled, minced, minute, and vile little thing, and they would think not only that the poets ought not to be read, but not even to be touched, since they would claim that they offer us nothing at all for the ‘drawing of the thread of free and fruitful eloquence’ (as it is called), and that they offer nothing to the reader other than sheer pleasure. The opinions of these men I have always judged to be false. For poetic education is bound up with things which pertain to war, to the customs of good, and likewise, bad men, of the citizen and the workman, and treats both god and those below most elegantly, as Plato supposes no less ingeniously than truly.

While somewhat hyperbolic and reflective of the contemporary debate which grew out of increasing fanaticism for Ciceronian prose, this passage demonstrates Merula’s belief in a practical application for the study of ancient poetry. The Merula of the preface sees lessons to be learned from the poetry: it has military value, it offers examples of good and bad behavior, and teaches

---

92 f. 1v. All transcriptions and translations of the commentaries which follow are my own, unless otherwise noted.
93 More immediate to Merula’s time, a similar idea about the practicality of Ovid’s poetry was already in circulation, as is evidenced by a passage from the De puerorum educatione of Aeneas Silvius (1405-1464; later Pope Pius II), who writes (Latin text via Craig Kallendorf, Humanist Educational Treatises (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002), 220): Ovidius ubique tristis, ubique dulcis est, in plerisque tamen locis nimium lascivius. praeclarissimum tamen opus eius, cui metamorphoseos nomen indidit, propter fabularum periciam, quas noscere non parvi fructus est, nullo pacto postergandum (“Ovid is everywhere somber, everywhere he is sweet, and yet in many places he is too wanton. Nevertheless his work which he published under the title *Metamorphoses* is very famous, on account of the practical use of its stories, which are of no small enjoyment to know, and in no way to be shunned”). Such an outlook is also picked up by Regius in his preface to his comments on the *Metamorphoses*, which had been pirated by Merula.
metaphysical lessons as well. Furthermore, he outlines a group of uses for poetry intended to refute the claim made by poetry’s critics that it offered nothing for the teaching of oratorical eloquence. It teaches us character (mores), he says, and affect (affectiones), and shows how important affairs might be successfully managed (res gerendas cum iucunditate). Poetry produces in the orator an elevation of style, so Merula claims: Summos quoque oratores veterum poemata vel ad fidem causarum vel ad ornamentum eloquentiae assumpsisse legimus (“I have read even the best ancient orators take up poems, either to the credit of their case or for the adornment of their eloquence”).

One might expect, in the face of such assertions, that the content of Merula’s commentary will be concerned with matters both practical and rhetorical. This is not the case. Rhetorical comment is almost non-existent, excepting the occasional gloss of a figure of speech (for example, his identification of the Tristia’s opening prosopopoieia on f. 2r). This leads Ann Moss to assert that Merula “is far more interested in erudition than style.” However, Merula’s apparent dearth of stylistic and rhetorical analysis does not truly represent a lack of interest per se: all commentary at this time was in some way meant to serve rhetorical aims (collection of commonplaces, providing general topics for rhetorical invention and, most importantly, stylistic imitation), and Merula himself was interested in such matters (as his preface seems to suggest).

---

94 Renaissnace France, 19.
The educational level for which his *Tristia* commentary is written, however, has its own expectations and requirements which preclude detailed stylistic and rhetorical analyses—analyses which would not be understood by the early Latin learner. One must always keep in mind when positing a development in a commentary tradition over time that differences between commentaries may simply reflect the discrepancy in the educational level of the intended audience of the commentaries we possess, rather than a difference in the interests of the commentators or their intellectual community.

We should not judge Merula too harshly for this seeming disjunction between what he asserts and the content of his work. Merula is merely following the general trend of humanist education by offering the poets (and thereby Ovid’s *Tristia*) as a source for types of persuasion, rhetorical *inventio*, and the *loci communes* (commonplaces) that Renaissance pupils were instructed to collect. It was both a desirable and highly marketable skill to be able to flavor one’s letters with authentic ancient sayings on a multitude of topics: for the aristocracy, it proved one’s education and breeding, while for those who lacked noble blood, it offered an opportunity for the patronage of the well-bred who sought men to write their letters for them. Alongside this use for poetry, of course, is placed the old stand-by of Humanist self-justification, namely, the idea that morality and
good character can be inculcated through the study of Latin letters (see *consuetudines bonorum invicem et malorum* in the passage above).\textsuperscript{95}

Merula’s lack of rhetorical emphasis also has much to do with the purpose of his commentary. As he puts it, when he at last introduces the commentary itself:

\begin{quote}
Invenies tu quidem opus varia multiplicitque refertum doctrina, plenum affectibus et miseratione. Quod autem ad nos attinet in enarrando et corrigendo carmine multum laboravimus. Verum ut mihi id non assumo, quod Ion apud Platonem, qui gloriatur se praeclarissima de Homero prae caeteris enarraturum, ut neque Metodorus Lampsacenus, neque Stesimbrothus Thasius, neque Glaucnon, neque aliquis unquam veterum tot tanquam praecla Homeri sensa quot ille exponere queat, sic me in hoc poeta enarrando diligentie opera usum affirmor, nihilique pro virili parte pratermisisse, quod ad eius sensum eliciendum pertinet. Levicula quaedam etiam attigi, ut et tua causa non ita subactis ingeniis prodessem.\textsuperscript{96}
\end{quote}

You will find a work [the *Tristia*] brimming with various and multifaceted learning, full of emotion and pity. A characteristic, moreover, which was of interest to me in my exposition and correcting of the poetry and over which I labored greatly. But as I do not assume for myself that thing which Plato’s Ion boasts, that he can explicate the clearest explanations of Homer better than all others, that neither Metodorus Lampsacenus, nor Stesimbrothus Thasius, nor Glaucnon, nor any other of the ancients was able to explain so many things and Homer’s meaning so clearly as he; thus, for my part, in this poet, I affirm that I have been diligent in my exegesis, and to the best of my ability have overlooked nothing which pertains to the coaxing out of its meaning. I have even

\textsuperscript{95} This idea is not unique to the Renaissance commentary. It is clear from the contents of medieval *accessus* that nearly all literary works were categorized as ethical. For more, see Judson Boyce Allen, *The Ethical Poetic of the Later Middle Ages: A Decorum of Convenient Distinction* (Toronto: University fo Toronto Press, 1982).

\textsuperscript{96} f. 1v.
touched on certain trifles, so that for your sake I might benefit your unquenchable intellect.  

Merula combines his previous gesture toward the poem’s rhetorical utility (note his re-use of ‘affect’ and the addition of pity—useful tools for the orator) with a mention of what will, in reality, be the main focus of his commentary: 

\textit{varia multipliciaque doctrina} (“various and multi-faceted learning”). His commentary retains a great deal of the \textit{variorum}-like nature of densely commented medieval commentaries. While he does not comment on every word or line of the \textit{Tristia}, at times it seems that Merula tries his best to do so.

His glosses, like his assessment of the \textit{Tristia}, are varied in their educational contents, belonging to roughly five categories: the grammatical,

\footnote{Merula’s choice of Plato’s boastful \textit{Ion} as a \textit{comparandum} may be worth a moment’s examination, particularly when it comes to the issue of commentary’s interactions with an established tradition of cumulative glossing grounded in the \textit{auctoritas} of the ancient authors during the Middle Ages. Much recent debate has been centered on whether or not there is such a thing as ‘Renaissance commentary,’ and on just how derivative the commentaries of the 15th and 16th centuries were of their medieval predecessors (see for example, the proceedings of a conference on just this topic edited by Marianne Pade (\textit{On Renaissance Commentaries}). On the surface, Merula’s disclaimer is typical of the self-deprecation that occurs in a great many of the dedicatory letters that accompany commentary in this era. The Platonic context of \textit{Ion}’s boast, however, is within his greater claim that rhapsodes (\textit{Ion}’s chosen profession) function as a sort of funnel for the divine words of Homer, originating from a divine, authoritative source, meaning that rhapsodes like himself serve, for all intents and purposes, as mere mouthpieces of the tradition. In Merula’s choice to disassociate himself from such a character, there may be an attempt to distinguish himself from previous commentators by setting himself up as an anti-Ion. It may also be possible that he is making a statement about his employment of his own intellectual discretion, as flawed as he makes it out to be, in the face of the well-established and handed-down authority of the medieval commentary tradition. Despite such an assertion, how well Merula performs in this regard is open for debate, but such a shift in attitude of the commentator ought to be noted: whether or not a ‘Renaissance commentary’ exists, or is an entirely fictitious concept, such instances where the commentator seeks to establish his own independent authority demonstrate that the commentators themselves thought that they were doing something different, or at least wanted to make it appear as though they were.}
etymological, geographical, historical, and the mythological. When Merula’s young protégés were finished with their course of study, they could expect to be instructed not only in the poem’s narrative and themes, but more broadly on the whole of classical antiquity and ancient learning. An excellent example of this tendency comes from his commentary on Tr. 3.7, Ovid’s elegy to Perilla, in which he instructs her to continue her pursuit of poetry. In this pathos-laden elegy, where later commentators might make note of Ovid’s rhetorical strategy and overarching theme of poetic immortality, Merula instead focuses on where he can make a practical difference in his reader’s general education: he provides a technical discussion of poetic meter and metrical terminology.\footnote{Merula, 36v-37r.} In sum, the focus of his pedagogy greatly reflects the method of the medieval classroom, which generally placed its emphasis on attaining knowledge and drilled swift recall of facts, rather than focusing on primary, subjective interpretation of material.

\textit{1b. Three functions of Merula’s Tristia commentary}

In the transmission of this knowledge, Merula displays a broad antiquarian streak, and his fascination with the practices of the ancient world is clearly evident. For an example of his method and a characteristic comment, consider his long gloss on Tr. 1.1.11, on the words caedrus:\footnote{I have here capitalized the lemma for the reader’s convenience, though they are not thus in the text of the commentary. The entries are distinguished by a double space before the phrase which}

NOR ARE YOUR PAGES TINGED WITH CEDAR. Cedar is a tree which does not feel the effects of decay and age, nor does it develop cracks and fissures on its own. From this tree’s beams the temple of Diana of Ephesus was constructed, as Pliny teaches. This same writer also writes that in Europe liquid pitch from its torches is cooked for the strengthening of ships and for many other uses. Its wood is chopped up and made red-hot in ovens surrounded on the outside by iron so that the first drippings of liquid flow out in channels. This is called Caedrium in Syria, and its powers are such that in Egypt, it preserves the bodies of the dead who have been smeared with it. And elsewhere he writes, “The ‘Great Cedar’, which they call ‘caedrelate’ makes pitch, which is called ‘cedria’, that is

is followed by a punctus. In my transcriptions, I have followed the spelling and punctuation as it is produced in the original. Abbreviations have been expanded without notation. I have reproduced this comment nearly in its entirety to give a sense of the expansive nature of a great many of his comments.

100 Nat. Hist. 24.17.
101 The passage in question is De Arch. 2.9.13, though this is not a direct quote.
102 Nat. Hist. 13.84.
very useful for tooth pain. Indeed it breaks them [i.e. the teeth] and draws
them out, and dulls the pain. The cedar sap which somehow comes from
this tree, as I have said, is of great use for the eyes, unless it brings on a
headache. It preserves dead bodies, and destroys living tissue—a
marvelous difference—since it steals life from the breathing, and replaces
it in the dead. It also destroys clothing and kills animals.” Vitruvius also
writes in his second book that books rubbed with cedar oil fear neither
bookworms nor decay, which Pliny also teaches, writing, “Cnaeus
Terrentius, a clerk, while digging in his field on the Janiculum hit upon a
box in which Numa, who was king of Rome, was buried.” In this same
box books of papyrus were also found to have survived 535 years,
unharmed by worms, which were treated with cedar oil (though there are
no shortage of those who read not ‘caedratos’ but ‘caeratos’).103

In this comment one may see Merula’s style at work, and it becomes clear that he
needs little excuse to wander off into tangential areas of discussion; he was
certainly not an adherent to Quintilian’s famous maxim, ‘inter virtutes grammatici
habebitur aliqua nescire’ (“Not knowing everything will be counted among a
commentator’s strengths”).104 For Merula, this process of outward expansion is at
the heart of how commentary educates. His extraction of the varia doctrina
contained in Ovid’s poetry relies heavily on his skillful use of digression to
branch into topics with which the poem being glossed has exceedingly little
contact. In the comment excerpted above, he begins simply enough, with a
straightforward definition of a word which is likely unfamiliar to the student
(caedro): a cedar is a tree. Merula then hints at its relevance to the passage at

103f. 2r. It is worth noting that L. Jan and C. Mayhoff’s edition of Pliny (C. Plinius Secundus
Naturalis Historia (Stuttgart: Teubner, 1923)) prints ‘citratos’: ‘steeped in citrus oil’.
104 Inst. Or. 1.8.21.
hand: it is not affected by decay. At this point the reader understands that the ‘cedar’ of Tr. 1.1.11 must have to do with preservation of the papyrus of Ovid’s book.

Merula is by no means finished, however; he then digresses into the properties of the plant which are useful and a discussion of its produce, which develops into an anecdote (i.e. the recovery of the ark on the Janiculum). At this point the comment has come full circle back to relevance to the text of Ovid which is under examination: books which are properly finished are sealed with cedar oil for their protection. Merula does not interpret the implication of this statement for Ovid’s poetry, i.e. that he is rhetorically situating his poems as unfinished and crude and suggesting that they are somehow vulnerable to attack from exterior forces. Merula always stops short of such subjective analysis.

It is worth noting that Merula’s anecdotal information, unlike the botched remembrances and fanciful elaborations of medieval commentators, are

---

105 The format of the printing makes the progression of thought in these digressions easy to trace. The margins of the commentary contain finding aids which are keyed to its text; for the comment under discussion the headings read: Caedrus, Caedrium, Caedri succus, Libri oleo caedrino ungebantur.

106 One good example of such confusion and elaboration which is characteristic was cited by E. H. Alton (in “The Mediaeval Commentators on Ovid’s Fasti,” Hermathena 20 (1930), 123) from an anonymous commentary on the Fasti (contained in Copenhagen, Kongelige Bibliotek, Gl. kgl. Saml. 2010 4°), which can help us understand the differences in the way that medieval and Renaissance commentators use sources. In his gloss on Gaius Flaminius at F. 6. 765, the commentator writes: Ipse flaminius consul romanus volens ire contra dedit suis vulturibus cibum et noluerunt comedere, quod fuit signum istius in bello morituri. et eos interfecti et in bello perit; vel secundum quosdam in transinino fluvio submersus est cum rediret a bello devictis hostibus quia cum aves sue nolissent comedere ipse dixit saltem bibant et eas mersit in quodam fluvio (“The Roman consul Flaminius, intending to go to combat, gave food to his vultures and they would not eat—the sign of his coming death in battle. And he killed them and died in battle; or, according to some, he...
always cited directly from a source document (in this case the elder Pliny)—a trait which separates Merula from his predecessors. This, of course, means that Merula was likely fortunate enough to have his source material for such anecdotes close at hand, since he is able to produce direct quotations. We can see in the above that he recalled that Vitruvius mentions the protective qualities of cedar oil, but lacking the material for a direct citation, he further corroborates his recollection with what sources he does have nearby.

The second function of Merula’s commentary is, as he stated in his preface, is *sensum eliciendum*, the ‘coaxing out of the sense’ of the material. This is what he has done in the comment above: he defines the word in question and elucidates its relevance to the line of poetry so that it can be understood. But there are also other types of ‘sense-making’ glosses, a great number of which stand unencumbered by Merula’s intellectual wanderings. These are the common substitutions of familiar synonyms for unfamiliar words, prose reorderings, and grammatical assistance. Let us take another example from *Tr*. 1.1, here his comments on vv. 3-4, which read *Vade, sed incultus, qualem decet exulis*

drowned in Lake Trasimene upon his return from war and conquering the enemy because he drowned his birds in the lake saying, “At least let them drink!” because they would not eat”). The confusion here is clear: the commentator is using his memory to recall the story. He has it that Flaminius himself took the auspices rather than his augur, whom he ignored. Furthermore, he has conflated this story with the story of P. Clodius Pulcher’s famous drowning of the sacred chickens. And the vultures are an entirely new element, fancifully imagined by the commentator (see Fritsen, “Ovid’s *Fasti,*” 39 for detailed analysis, as well as the recounting of a similar instance from Arnulf of Orléans).
esse, / infelix habitum temporis huius habe (“Go! But go unadorned, as befits an exile, O unlucky one; take on an appearance of this condition”):

SED INCULTUS. sed vade inornatus. QUALEM DECET EXULIS ESSE.
Exules enim prae maerore lugubri veste citra ullum ornatum induuntur. Est autem ordo: o infelix habe habitum huius temporis talem qualem decet habitum exulis esse.

BUT UNADORNED. ‘But go unadorned.’ AS BEFITS AN EXILE. For exiles, on account of their grievous sorrow, clothed themselves in garments lacking any adornment. This, however, is the order: O unlucky one, take an appearance of this condition, such an appearance as befits an exile.

The gloss first provides a synonym for incultus (inornatus) which Merula assumes is more familiar. There follows, in his usual fashion, some modicum of cultural information; here it concerns the dress of exiles, a fact that also makes sense of the appearance that Ovid intends for his book. Then he offers a prose reordering of the line. He explains that infelix is to be taken as a vocative, and clarifies the confusion elicited by Ovid’s ellipses of both the correlative talem and the second habitum. This then makes clear what is to be done with the prepositive genitive exulis in v. 3.

The third intention of the commentary relates to Merula’s statement (from his preface) that he has “even touched on certain trifles, so that for your sake I

---

107 In this case the information comes without an ancient source; in these smaller, ‘sense-making’ glosses Merula is more likely to recall information more generally from memory. It is also quite likely that this type of unsourced comment represents his own interpretation of the verse, independent of the auctores: this, therefore, is where we can see Merula himself at work.
might benefit your unquenchable intellect,” (Levicula quaedam etiam attigi, ut et tua causa non ita subactis ingeniis prodessem). Though the letter is clearly addressed to the Cornaro scion, its presence at the front of a published volume suggests that it is intended to address the viewing public at large, as there is no inscriptio ad lectorem—a feature which would become popular in later commentary. The eager reader (i.e. the one with an unquenchable thirst for information about the ancient world) is meant to find entertainment in the commentary as well, taking amusement from the ‘trifles’ which he introduces throughout. In sum, the commentary ought to instruct, but not to the complete detriment of the reader’s delight. Merula accomplishes this by his focused reproduction of anecdotes and information from the ancient sources which would fall under the heading thaumata (‘wonders; marvels’ from the Greek verb θαυμάζειν).

Such bits of

108 Terrentius’ discovery, cited in the comment on cedar oil above, would fall in this category. A further (and rather interesting) example may be found in his gloss at Tr. 1.2.82 (on f. 6v), wherein he enlightens the readers as to the armaments used by the Sauromatae: thoracibis fabricandis hoc eorum consilium: Equarum armenta singuli pastunt, qum ager in privatorum portione divisus non sit Numidarum more. nec quique ferat propter agrestem silvam: equabus non ad bellum solum utuntur: se etiam diis patriis immolant et iisdem vescuntur earunque ungulas expurgant et in subtilissimas partes scindunt. inde draconum squamis opus simile textunt. eas perforatos equorum et bovum nervis assuunt. atque ita utuntur pro thoracibus (“This is their way of making breastplates: each man pastures herds of mares, since the land is not divided into private allotments in the manner of the Numidæ, nor does it bear any wild woods. They employ mares not only for war, but also burn them as sacrifice to their gods, and eat them; they clean their hooves and split them into very small parts, from which they weave a work something akin to serpent scales. They perforate these and string them together with horse or cow sinew, and use these for chest armor,”). This is a paraphrase of Pausanias 1.21.5: the Latin portions match up very well with the original Greek, but some information has been left out. Whether Merula was utilizing a Greek version of Pausanias is not certain; there was certainly no published edition until Aldus Manutius’ editio princeps of 1516. There was a MS copy in Venice that was copied for Domizio Calderini to be used for his translation (it is now Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit, MS BPG 16 L). What is most likely, it seems, is that Merula was employing Calderini’s partial Latin translation (which reaches up to the beginning of Book 2), which was published posthumously at Venice c. 1500.
information achieve the goal of offering historical and cultural information, but remain classed as ‘trifles’ since they have only tangential reference to the exposition of the poetry itself. In the competitive world of late 15th-century Venetian print commentary (as well as in today’s market), the ability to keep students interested—particularly the students of a more elementary level, at whom Merula’s commentary was aimed—would have been an important selling point.

1c. Style and textual criticism

In general, Merula’s ego stays submerged beneath the bulk of his commentary and rises to the surface only occasionally to make note of variant readings of certain passages in the first person, opining on which reading he prefers. Despite his assertions in the preface about the moral component of poetry, Merula himself takes no part in extracting moral lessons for the reader from the text of the Tristia, and allegorical interpretation, which generally went hand-in-hand with such moral didacticism throughout the Middle Ages, is entirely absent from his expositions. One may, however, infer his other interests from the content of his comments. He is keen on linguistic issues and etymology,

This would account for the paraphrase’s closeness to the Greek. See George B. Parks, "Pausanias," Catalogus Translationum et Commentariorum 2 (1971).
both of everyday words and especially place names. He is also interested in proper usage, often citing how a particular word is used in various authorities in an effort to triangulate something approximating a ‘real’ linguistic, formalistic meaning, and in order to discern how certain words develop metaphorical meanings. He, like many other commentators, is eager to elaborate mythology, which he does in a style which is more expository than narrative.

As an editor of Ovid’s text, Merula only rarely offers emendations. These are made in the body of the commentary rather than by printing his proposed emendation in the text of his edition. He is generally willing to emend the text only in the direst of circumstances. Despite his lack of élan for emendation,

---

109 His etymologies may, for the most part, be traced to the expected medieval sources. The following etymological comment, found in Merula’s gloss on *clypeum* at 1.3.35 (f. 8r), is very similar to the etymology given in the *Catholicon* of Johannes de Balbis. The Greek portions, added from Pliny, are Merula’s own addition. He writes: *CLYPEUM. Deorum praesidium Clypeum appellat. Clypeos autem quidam dictos putant quod clepant, idest celent corpus periculisque subducant. Quidam vero a cluendo: Cluere enim antiqui pugnare dicebant ut Plinius docet. Unde Venus Cluacina appellata fuit. Clypeus vero a lucendo. Eius verba haec sunt: “Scutis enim, qualibus apud Troiam pugnatum est, continebantur imagines, unde et nomen habuere clupeorum, non, ut perversa grammaticorum subtilitas voluit, a cluendo.” Ille verborum locum atque a lucendo scriptum est quum a cluendo legendum sit. Illud notandum Clypeum genere neutro proferri, quod Pollio in Claudii Vita his verbis: “Illi Clypeus aureus vel (ut grammatici loquentur) clupeum aureum senatus totius iudicio in Romana curia collocatum est.” Plinius tamen semper virili genere protulit, (“CLYPEUM. He calls the protection of the gods his ‘shield’. Certain people, however, think they are called ‘clypei’ because they ‘clepant’, that is, hide the body and push dangers aside. Others still [think it to be] from ‘cluendo’. For the ancients said cluere for ‘to fight’, whence Venus Cluacina was named. But Pliny, in Book 35 (*Natural History*) says it is from γλύφω, which is ‘I carve’. His words are these: “For shields, the sort with which the fighting was done at Troy, held carved images, whence they took their name ‘clypei’, not, as the perverse logic of the grammarians would have it, from cluendo.” In this spot, Pliny [the source text] must be corrected: where ‘a lucendo’ is written, it should be ‘a cluendo’. It is worth noting that Clypeus is offered as a neuter noun, which Pollio teaches in his *Life of Claudius* in these words: “For him, by the decree of the whole senate, a *Clupeus aureus* [golden shield] or (as the grammarians say) *clypeum aureum* was set up in the Roman forum.” Pliny nevertheless uses it as a masculine noun”). It is worth noting that ‘even Homer may nod,’ as here Merula has misinterpreted the significance of Venus Cloacina, who had her shrine in the Roman Forum at the mouth of the great drain of the Cloaca Maxima.
Merula was entirely capable of utilizing all of his knowledge to unravel a difficult reading. One example of his critical acumen can be found in his comments on *Tr*.1.10.35, wherein he is uncomfortable with the text containing *Heniochosque sinus* (f. 15v). He first provides a full account for the name and location of *Heniochi*, before proceeding to make an argument, based on the trajectory of Ovid’s sailing journey and employing Pliny, Ptolemy, Pomponius Mela, and Strabo as sources, that the passage should actually read *Thynniacosque sinus*, on account of the city of Thynnias which sat on the western shore of the Black Sea.\(^{110}\)

\(^{110}\) The most reliable MS of the *Tristia* (Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, MS Marcianus lat. 223), which Merula is unlikely to have seen, reads *thynantiosque*, which is quite close to Merula’s own suggestion. Merula’s reading is retained in S. G. Owen, *P. Ovidi Nasonis Tristium libri quinque, Ibis, Ex Ponto libri quattuor, Halieutica, fragmenta* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1915).
this was done. These versions, like all of the French versions of the commentary, are printed not alongside Merula’s own edition of the text, but rather with the edition of Aldus Manutius (first published Venice, 1503). 1520 saw three new versions: two more from Paris and another at Milan. There was a lull in production until the commentary gained a brief second wind in composite commentaries published in 1550 at Basel and 1553 at Paris which combine Merula’s commentary with the newly published commentary of the German humanist Vitus Amerbachius, to whom we shall now turn.

2. Vitus Amerbachius (1503-c. 1557)

About the author of the subsequent print commentary on Ovid’s Tristia, Vitus Amerbachius [Veit Amerbach or Veit Trollman], considerably more is known. He was born in Bavaria (he is given the appellation Vendigensis, which would make him a native of Wemding), and was educated at Ingolstadt, Freiburg, and eventually Wittenberg (matriculating by 1522). He is known to have been a pupil of the Protestant reformer and friend of Martin Luther,

111 Moss, Renaissance France, 19. This is number 65 in Moss’s “Check-list of Editions”.
112 Those of Aubry and Bonnemere (for J. Petit). These are number 86 and 87 in Moss’s “Check-list of Editions.”
113 Number 184 in Moss’s “Check-list of Editions”. The commentaries of Merula and Amerbach were also printed together in the variorum edition Pub. Ovidii Nasonis Sulmonensis poetae operum tom. secundus in quo libri Fastorum VI, Tristius V, De Ponto IV (Frankfurt: Marinus & Aubrius, 1601) along with the annotations of Jacobus Micyllus [Jakob Moltzer]. While Merula and Micyllus’ comments accompany the text, Amerbach’s work is placed at the end; this is likely due to its characterization as an expositio rather than annotationes.
Johannes Agricola, under whom he taught at Eisleben beginning in 1526. He returned to Wittenberg around 1530 to teach rhetoric and physics, where he became a follower of both Luther and Philipp Melanchthon, though it is certainly debatable whether he ought to be included in the group that Lynn Thorndike called “The Circle of Melanchthon.” There he remained until sometime after 1542, when philosophical and theological disagreements between Amerbach and Melanchthon became too much for the former to bear, causing him to leave for his native Bavaria, where he would eventually take up a post as a professor of rhetoric at Ingolstadt. The falling out and philosophical differences must have been acute, as Amerbach removed himself from the Protestant cause by returning himself and his family to the Catholic Church. As a scholar, his interests were entirely rhetorical and philosophical: he published commentaries on Cicero’s *De Officiis* and several of his orations, Aristotle, and the *Ars Poetica* of

---


115 This is the title of Chapter 17 of the fifth volume of Lynn Thorndike’s monumental eight volume *History of Magic and Experimental Science* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1928-1953).

116 On the dispute see Sachiko Kusukawa, *The Transformation of Natural Philosophy: The Case of Philip Melanchthon* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 108-9. The dispute seems to have arisen over two issues that were at the heart of the Reformation: the doctrine of justification by faith and the primacy of the Pope. Amerbach’s point of view is evidenced in his *Quattuor libri de anima* (published right before his departure in 1542). We know that Amerbach remained in Wittenberg at least until 1542, since the salutation of the dedicatory letter contained in his commentary on Horace’s *Ars Poetica*, which was published in 1543, is dated 1542 at Wittenberg. The prefaces to volumes following this one are inscribed from Wemding or Ingolstadt.
Horace. He also penned two philosophical works, the *Quattuor libri de anima* (1542) and the *Libri VI de philosophia naturali* (1549).\(^{117}\)

2a. Why the *Tristia*?

How are we to interpret Amerbach’s choice to compose a commentary on the entirety of Ovid’s *Tristia* in the larger context of his other works?\(^{118}\) There are two possible avenues to understanding Amerbach’s selection of topic, both of which have interesting implications concerning his attitude towards Ovid’s exilic elegies. We must first consider that Amerbach’s only other foray into commentary on poetic subject matter was produced on a work (the *Ars Poetica*) which is, *prima facie*, a work of aesthetic philosophy and rhetoric. This would lead to the supposition that Amerbach viewed the *Tristia* as a work that was in the same vein as the *Ars Poetica*; that it was a work worthy of the attention of the Renaissance rhetorician with an interest in poetics. The supposed rhetorical utility of the *Tristia* (as Merula’s prefatory letter made clear) was already firmly established, but Amerbach does not seek to merely mine the work for *sententiae*.

---

\(^{117}\) The first editions of the works cited here are as follows, in the order in which they were mentioned: *Commentaria Viti Amerbachii in Ciceronis tres libros de officiis. Iam denuo ab ipso autore recogn. et multis in locis aucta* (Strasbourg: Mylius, 1539); *In artem poeticam Horatii commentaria* (Strasbourg: Mylius, 1547); *Viti Amerbachii quattuor libri de anima* (Strasbourg: Mylius, 1542); *Viti Amerbachii Vendingensis libri sex, de philosophia naturali : quibus non ad Aristotelis tantum, sed recentiorum etiam de his rebus tractationes, adeoque res ipsas intelligendas uia sternitur, ac tanquam ostium quoddam recluditur : in dedicationis epistola defenditur etiam alia quaedam similis, ad Erasmum Volfium : accessit locuples rerum et verborum memorabilium index* (Basel: Oporinus, 1549).

\(^{118}\) The full title of this commentart is *Ennaratio librorum Ovidii De Tristibus, & Paraphrasis duarum Ovidianarum, Aiacis & Ulyssis, orationum, a Vito Amerpachio conscripta, nunc que primum in lucem edita*, (Basel: Oporinus, 1549). I will hereafter refer to this work simply as ‘Amerbach.’
to be placed in a commonplace book; rather, he prefers to put himself to work exploring the argumentative processes employed by the exilic Ovid. In 1549, the study of rhetoric by way of Classical texts was coming into its prime, and it is clear that Amerbach was not alone in his opinion that Ovid’s *Tristia* held key insights for the advanced study of rhetoric. Peter Ramus’s influential treatise on rhetorical invention, the *Dialectique* (published 1555, Paris) took more of its *exempla* from the *Tristia* than from any other source.\(^{119}\) Amerbach, too, is particularly concerned with the processes of *inventio*, and his commentary may have been influential in Ramus’ choice of excerpts.

The second possibility is more related to Amerbach’s personal circumstances and, therefore, more speculative. The date of the commentary’s publication makes it fairly certain that Amerbach was busy working on his *Tristia* commentary seriously, with intent to publish, in the period after his exodus from the university at Wittenberg. It is entirely possible that his self-imposed exile from the environs that had been his home for his entire adult life, and the harsh feelings that brought about his departure spurred Amerbach to take up the *Tristia* as his subject matter. This would go some way to explaining the emphasis of the beginning of his prefatory letter:

\[
\textit{Anima est amica amanti. Si ea abest, nullus, est: Si adest res nulla est, ipsus est nequam, et miser}^{120}: \textit{inquit poeta vetus argute simul, et vere. Sic enim res habet}
\]

\(^{120}\) Plautus, *Bacchides* 193-4.
“A mistress is her lover’s soul. If she be absent, he is nothing. If present, his estate is nothing, and he himself is a vile wretch.” Thus spoke the poet of old keenly and with truth. Thus indeed does the matter hold in impure and rash love. But so far is that chaste and seeing love of ours from considering trivial what one person loves in another, that this thing [i.e. what one loves in another] is something at the same time both most upright and full of profit and pleasure. Indeed it does not make us pitiable, when we examine each other either with the eyes of our bodies—something which to this point has only come about once—or the ‘eyes’ of our letters (may you suffer me to conjoin the two), and converse with the mouths of both; how much more blessed it seems to make us, and more excited and active. Thus indeed it comes about among mankind that perpetual presence of even the most excellent things breeds satiety and loathing....Indeed does not even the common crowd say that excessive familiarity breeds contempt?

Behind the flattering rhetoric characteristic of Renaissance dedications, one may detect an element of self-consolation and residual ill-will towards his situation. His characterization of written communication as ‘better than the real thing’ is nothing extraordinary, but it seems as though Amerbach, through a letter nominally addressed to a patron, is speaking to himself, hoping to convince himself that his removal from Wittenberg is perhaps for the best, and that even
absence may be bridged by the written word, which will produce a new excitement and vigor. This is, of course, all very fitting considering the work to which this letter is attached, and suggests a certain degree of self-identification with the narrator of the *Tristia*, whose impetus for poetic production largely stems from the very same desire to bridge space via Latin letters.

Furthermore, this sympathy with the exilic Ovid can be found in the commentary as well. As I shall show in the more detailed examination of his commentary, part of Amerbach’s pedagogical method involves the assumption of Ovid’s voice, through which he offers new and (in his eyes) better defenses against the charge laid upon the poet. Amerbach also makes judgmental statements about the unfairness and harshness of Ovid’s punishment.

2b. *Commentary and method*

Amerbach’s introduction to the work as a whole comes in the form of an *argumentum operis* (“subject of the work”) which he attaches to the beginning of the commentary.121 Interestingly, Amerbach, like Merula, is also compelled to begin his *Tristia* commentary with a defense of poetry; instead of being directed against the champions of prose (like Merula’s), however, it is aimed at the “Professors of Theology” who take a more puritanical position on poetic

---

121 In some later composite editions that include Amerbach’s commentary, his *argumentum* is placed in an appendix.
matters. He dismisses their complaints out of hand, with the air of a man who believes that the argument is firmly settled. He begins:

Notum est, non solum utilem, sed etiam liberalem, et necessariam propemodum lectionem poetarum, atque poeticae cognitionem, et doctrinam esse in omni genere disciplinarum, idque multi magni veteres et recentiores, gravibus argumentis probaverunt, ne dicam ab ipsa experientia clare hoc demonstrari. Nihilominus tamen his temporibus inveniuntur, et gravissimae quidem, si diis placet, ac sanctissimae doctrinae Theologiae professores, qui putent poetas, et ipsam eorum facultatem adeo non prodesse moribus et pietati, ut obsint etiam...

It is a known fact that the reading of poets and the understanding of poetics, and training in them is not only useful, but also gentlemanly, and, dare I say, necessary in every sort of discipline; this is something many great men, of old and more recent, have proved with serious arguments—nay, I should say it was demonstrated by active practice itself. Nevertheless in our age one can find—and this is indeed very serious, please god—professors of the most sacred doctrine of Theology, who not only suppose that the poets and their resources lack benefits for one’s character and piety, but that they also hinder it...

In this opening paragraph, Amerbach begins to show his sympathies: his dismissal of the idea that poetry obstructs proper morality aligns him with Ovid in the Tristia, particularly Ovid of Book 2, who argues that it is upon the reader’s

122 Whether he has specific men in mind, or is setting up these detractors as rhetorical straw men is uncertain, as Amerbach refuses to name names.
123 These recentiores, to Amerbach’s mind are likely to include Melanchthon, who was a proponent of the study of poetry. For a single example, he writes in his oration on the arts course, “You should master both verse and free speech; for I see those who do not attain poetry speak somewhat more tediously, and merely crawl on the ground, and have neither weightiness of words nor any strength of figures of speech,” and, claims that when poetry is despised “it comes about that the ornaments and splendour of words are not held in regard, people write with less care, everything is read more negligently, and the zeal for inquiring into things flags.” The translation is from Sachiko Kusukawa, Philip Melanchthon: Orations on Philosophy and Education (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 72-3.
124 Amerbach, 1.
own response to the poetry that the weight of moral judgment ought to fall, rather than upon the poet or the poetry itself. As Amerbach continues, his own arguments follow that same logic, as he points out that people who make improper use of poetry are already themselves immoral, thereby exonerating poetry from blame. He writes that they call for the rejection of poetry “as though indeed they were not the many abusers, who even daily abuse not only the other very best arts, but even Theology, sacred letters, and that most sacred thing, the very name of God.”

It may be the case that a work like the Tristia, which is so concerned with the effects of poetry upon those it touches, produces in the critic a desire to come to its defense.

In his true introduction to the work itself, Amerbach cites the virtues which make it worthy of study. The first of these is its mira varietas (“wondrous variety”), which immediately calls to mind Merula’s citation of the work’s varia doctrina (“multifarious teachings”). The varietas which Amerbach lauds, however, is something quite different. Amerbach here means not a wealth of varied information, but a broad variation of both expression and topics that might aid the student of rhetoric to better persuade (through the imitation of Ovidian pathos, for example) and to discover arguments and topics for his own orations and letters (through the process of inventio). Secondly, Amerbach touts the Tristia’s inimitabilis felicitas summaque suavitas in media fortunae acerbitate

---

125 quasi vero non plurimi sint abusi, et quotidie abutabantur non tantum aliis optimis artibus, vero etiam Theologia, sacris litteris, et, quo nihil est sanctius, ipso DEI nomine. (Amerbach, 1).
(“inimitable happiness and peerless charm in the midst of the harshness of fortune”); this seems a rather optimistic take on the contents of the collection of poems, but it also hints that Amerbach is attuned to the disjunctive nature of the Tristia: he draws attention to the fact that the appearance of the poem (entitled ‘Sadnesses’) may be hiding something entirely opposite. By evincing this particular trait of the Tristia, Amerbach is also suggesting that its value lies in its utility for the composition of consolationes (comforting or encouraging letters).

It is also worth noting that Amerbach saw no difference between the contents of the Tristia and the Epistulae ex Ponto, aside from the most obvious: “This work is not at all different from the books of the Ex Ponto, except that in those the poet placed the names of his friends—here he did not place them—wherever he was able.” Amerbach wishes the reader to see the two works almost as though they were one: the Ex Ponto is simply a Tristia which names names. This minor assertion offers the reader some idea of the way in which Amerbach had been taught to read the exile poems, due to the fact that there are subtle differences in the medieval accessus tradition regarding the content of the Tristia and Ex Ponto. In the medieval accessus to the Tristia and Ex Ponto edited by Huygens, there is slightly more variation posited between the two works with

---

126 In fact, there seems to be a disconnect between this statement and the one which precedes it, wherein Amerbach says that in the Tristia, “Ovid chiefly laments his distress,” (miseria conqueratur potissimum Ovidius).

127 aliud nihil differt hoc opus a libris de Ponto, nisi quod Poeta in illis amicorum nomina posuit, hic non posuit, sicubi potuit ponere (Amerbach, 2).
regards to their respective subjects. The Tristia primarily contains “periculorum descriptio” (“a litany of dangers/tribulations”) while the Ex Ponto has at its core “amici...ad quos scribit” (“the friends to whom he writes”). William of Orléans makes no mention of the similarities or differences of their content. The supposed Arnulf commentary (‘Arnulf 1’), contained in Cambridge, UL, MS Add. 4456, f.1 (mentioned above), however, states that the Tristia differs from the Ex Ponto “quod in hoc [i.e. Tristia] non nominat ad quos scribit” (“in that in this one he does not name those to whom he writes”). 128

Furthermore, like in Merula, the circumstances of Ovid’s banishment are given scant attention. Concerning its causes, Amerbach is content to merely point out that “so much as is sufficient and possible to be known is declared openly in the poem itself.” 129

The commentary introduces each elegy with a prefatory argumentum which gives the overall subject matter and highlights some of the elegy’s key

---

128 Such an assimilation of the two works can have a marked effect upon the way in which they are read. If the Ex Ponto is simply the Tristia with the names of addressees included, it produces a picture of a poet who is either increasingly desperate for aid or increasingly careless with the safety of his friends as he seeks his own salvation. Likewise, the Epistulæ ex Ponto may reflect its title back upon the Tristia, causing it to be viewed as wholly a collection of epistolary elegies with the addressees excised, when not every elegy must be read as such because they are easily understood without assuming an epistolary intent. The distinction between the two works seems to have been more clearly defined by some critics in the Middle Ages (like the accessus from Huygens mentioned above). This particular view may be reflected in the Ex Ponto’s greater popularity at the time: as a collection of letters it had a greater rhetorical and educational value than the not-so-epistolary Tristia. For more on the relative popularity of these works in the Middle Ages, see Hexter, Ovid and Medieval Schooling, 95-99.

129 Porro de causa exilii, in ipso poemate, quantum satur est ac sciri potest, indicatur (Amerbach, 2).
features. These are straightforward and simple. For example, the introduction to the first elegy of the collection reads:

_Mandatum continet haec Elegia. Iubet enim per aptissimam prosopopoeiam librum suum Romam ire: ac sollicite praescribit ei, quid facere, quomodo se gerere debeat._

This elegy contains a command. He bids his book, by way of a very fitting personification, to go to Rome, and anxiously instructs it what to do and how it ought to conduct itself.¹³⁰

Already, in this simple introduction, Amerbach begins to reveal his system of instruction. First he classifies the elegy to a particular category, here, a command, which is then further specified. He intends the student to make note of this, so that when he needs to write a letter that instructs, he has as a model _Tr._ 1.1. It also serves as an example of an address to a personified object, another useful tool for the student of rhetoric. Amerbach continues:

_Incipit mandatum cum Elegia: in secundo versu est pathos a loco. Deinde mandat de habitu corporis per antitheton._

He begins the command along with the elegy; in the second verse there is “emotional appeal by place.” Thereupon he gives orders concerning the clothes it will wear through _antitheton._

In these first few lines of the commentary, Amerbach already references three rhetorical terms. His identification of _antitheton_ is important, as it points to the

---

¹³⁰ Here Amerbach is also similar to the ‘Arnulf’ commentary. The mention of the _prosopopoeia_ is common throughout the medieval commentaries I have examined, but Amerbach’s ‘quid facere’ and ‘quomodo se gerere debeat’ are reminiscent of the ‘quos evitet’ and ‘quo modo se debeat habere’ of ‘Arnulf.’
emphasis that Amerbach places upon the methods of rhetorical invention. *Antitheton* is one of the tools of *inventio*; it is a figure of thought involving contraries, (not to be confused with *antithesis*, the side-by-side placement of opposing terms or ideas,) wherein one considers incompatibilities of things which are of like kind. Amerbach is interested in revealing the underlying rhetorical methods by which the *Tristia* was imagined and put together.

Amerbach’s explanations are for the most part grammatical and, as I have said, rhetorical. Furthermore, they maintain greater focus on the topic at hand than we saw in Merula, and leave significantly larger portions of the text uncommented upon (likely because Amerbach was writing after Merula: see below).

2c. Style

Amerbach makes clear that he is not writing simple commentary (which would be termed *annotationes* or *observationes*), but rather discursive descriptions and explanations of the work by using the term *expositio* within his book and section headings. We are, in fact, told in the conclusion to the work that his annotations represent the content of his lectures on the *Tristia* which were delivered to his university students in Ingolstadt. This means that comments

---

131 For the ancient authority on *antitheton*, see Quintilian, *Inst. Or.* 9.3.81-6.
132 The work as a whole is called an *enarratio* (a “detailed interpretation”) in its title.
133 Amerbach, 114.
on an individual elegy read more like a connected discussion of the whole poem, as opposed to a collection of distinct and self-contained commentary notes. As a result, the commentary becomes the ‘primary’ document, displacing the quantitative space of the poetry of the *Tristia* itself: it is transmitted in its original publication without an accompanying text of Ovid’s poem.\textsuperscript{134} Amerbach’s expositions are only sometimes keyed to citations from the text, and these blend into the body of the text, identifiable only by the double space which precedes them. In taking this expository approach, Amerbach is more likely than the other commentators to discourse on a large section of the text, as opposed to simply treating individual words or phrases.

\textit{2d. Rhetorical exposition}

Amerbach’s rhetorical comments can be divided very broadly into two categories. The first type illustrates how Ovid employs rhetoric in the arguments presented in any particular poem of the *Tristia*. Such comments are found throughout the exposition. The second type is made up of the summary sentences that occur at the end of each elegy. These classify each poem in its proper rhetorical category, and serve the student by providing him a reference for future \textit{inventio}.

\textsuperscript{134} This is, of course, reminiscent of the \textit{catena} commentary of both ‘Arnulf’ and William discussed above.
For a good example of the first sort, let us examine Amerbach’s discussion of *Tr.* 1.1.69-86, wherein Ovid warns his book to stay well away from the Palatine hill, the source of the thunderbolt which struck him.\(^\text{135}\) He writes:

> Sequitur anthypophora de intranda Caesaris domo….Quattuor exemplis hic utitur, postremo separato a reliquis per accomodationem, sua tamen etiam illis additur, sed utrobiique, sicut est mos huius Poetae, allegorice. Sumpta est prior allegorica a pugnantibus, posterior a navigantibus.\(^\text{136}\)

There follows an *anthypophora* concerning the entering of Caesar’s house,…he here uses four exempla, the last one distinguished from the rest by way of *accommodation*; even so to these he adds his own [examples], but one on either side, just as is this poet’s custom: allegorically. The former allegory is from fighting, the latter one from sailing.

Amerbach first identifies clearly the type of rhetorical figure being used to establish the passage; here it is an *anthypophora*, an initial rhetorical question posed to himself by his book (i.e. “You won’t send me to the Palatine will you?”)

\(^{135}\) *forsitan expectes, an in alta Palatia missum / scandere te iubeam Caesaremque domum. / ignoscant augusta mihi loca dique locorum! / uenit in hoc illa fulmen ab arce caput. / esse quidem memini mitissima sedibus illis / numina, sed timeo qui nocuere deos. / terretur minimo pennae stridore columba, / uangue, accipiter, saucia facta tuis. / nec procul a stabulis audet discedere, siqua / excussa est auidi dentibus agna lupi. / uitaret caelum Phaethon, si uiueret, et quos / optarat stulte, tangere nollet equos. / me quoque, quae sensi, fateor Iouis arma timere: / me reor infesto, cum tonat, igne peti. / quicumque Argolica de classe Capherea fugit, / semper ab Euboicis uela retorquet aquis; / et mea cumba semel vasta percussa / illum, quo laesa est, horret adire locum. (“Perhaps you are wondering whether I will send you up to the high Palatine and order you to scale to Caesar’s house. May its revered locations and their gods pardon me! From that citadel did the lightning come down upon my head. I recall that there are indeed very gentle powers in those places, but I fear the gods who did me harm. The dove, wounded by your talons, is spooked by the slightest flapping of your wing, O hawk. Nor does the lamb dare to depart far from the stables if it has been plucked from the hungry wolf’s bite. Phaethon would shun the sky, were he living, and would not wish to touch the horses which he foolishly coveted. I confess that I too fear the arms of Jove which I have felt: when it thunders, I think I am hunted by their harmful flame. Every man of the Argive fleet who escaped Capherea always turns his sails away from Euboean waters; and so my skiff, battered by a monstrous squall, is afraid to approach the place from whence it was wounded.”)

\(^{136}\) Amerbach, 4.
and its hypothetical answer (“No, and let me tell you why!”). Amerbach then explains that Ovid answers this rhetorical question through a series of examples: he inserts two examples from nature (the dove and the lamb) between two related personal examples (Ovid was struck by Jove’s weapons; Ovid is scared when it thunders). His last example is drawn \textit{per accommodationem}: it is tailored specifically to his target audience, in this case his book, who is setting out on a sea voyage; therefore, he chooses an example of sea-buffeted sailors and their avoidance of the waters that did them harm. In commenting on this passage, Amerbach provides a basic outline of the way in which Ovid has structured his choice of exempla for rhetorical effect.\textsuperscript{137} He then explains on what level of interpretation Ovid’s exempla are meant to be understood: in this case, the examples are classed as allegorical (\textit{allegorice}),\textsuperscript{138} which Amerbach notes is the case generally in the \textit{Tristia}. He then identifies for the reader from which spheres of activity the allegories are drawn (here, fighting and sailing).

The second type of rhetorical comment, the summary at the end of an elegy, provides the reader with the poem’s proper rhetorical taxonomy. In the case of \textit{Tr. 1.1}, he claims:

\textsuperscript{137} The structure produced is one like this: 1. Example of the ‘personal type’ #1 (Ovid himself is blasted by “Jove’s” lightning, (vv.72-5)); 2. \textit{exemplum} #1 (The dove avoids the hawk, (vv.75-6)); 3. \textit{exemplum} #2 (The lamb avoids the wolf, (vv.77-8)); 4. \textit{exemplum} #3 (Phaethon would avoid the horses of the Sun, (vv.79-80)); 5. Example of the ‘personal type’ #2 (Ovid is scared of thunder, (vv.81-2)); 6. \textit{exemplum} #4 \textit{per accommodtionem} (The storm-tossed Argives avoid Euboean waters, (vv.83-4)).

\textsuperscript{138} This is a late and rarely seen adverbial form.
Pertinet Elegia ad genus deliberativum. Est enim cognatum petitioni mandatum. Et hoc ab eo differt, quod in petizione argumentis est opus; hic vero sufficit ius, et auctoritas.

The elegy belongs to the deliberative type. Indeed the ‘mandate’ is related to the petition. And the latter differs from the former in that in a petition, proof is required; here, however, right suffices, and authority.

To Amerbach, the elegy is ultimately a long deliberative argument. Ovid commands his book and that command, like all commands, has its rhetorical authority by way of ius, here the power that Ovid holds over his creation as a father to a son. He then relates the type to cognate forms: Amerbach cites the petition, a form which is likely to see great use by the student at whom his commentary is aimed. He makes sure to cite the key difference between the two types of ‘mandates’: the petition bears the burden of proof.

2e. Grammar notes

Grammar remains a key point of emphasis for Amerbach as well. His grammatical comments, however, are not restricted to a passing identification of forms and prose reordering, which is often the extent of Merula’s grammatical commentary. Rather, Amerbach often analyzes the multiple possibilities of a form, and discusses how the alteration would change the sense of the poem. He also makes sure to identify the reading that he thinks is the correct one, which is a clear exertion of authorial power over the text. For example, at Tr. 1.1.26, causa
patrocinio non bona maiör erit, ("A no-good case will get worse by way of its defense," ) his comments are as follows:

Patrocinio est ablatiūus causae, ut ego puto: et Maior, deterior significant, ut sit sententia, Haec mala causa fit deterior si defenditur. Potest etiam ita exponī comparative, causa non bona erit maiör patrocinio: id est difficiliōr quam ut possit defendi….Primam sententiam sequor, Interpres secundam.

Patricinio is an ablative of cause, as I see it, and ‘greater’ stands for ‘worse,’ so that the sense becomes: ‘This bad case becomes worse if defended.’ It is also able to be explained comparatively: ‘a no-good case will be greater than the defense’—that is, a more difficult case than can be defended…. I follow the first sense, the interpres [his appellation for Merula] the second.

The grammatical point of discussion here, of course, is whether to read patrocinio as an ablative of cause (as Amerbach does), or as an ablative of comparison (per Merula). The second sense is followed by the most prominent English translations, but this example well demonstrates Amerbach’s value as a reader of Ovid’s text; his rendering of the line seems to better fit the self-defeatist tone taken by Ovid in this particular elegy, as well as the recurring theme of the volume that one’s own words may harm oneself, and his later characterization of his ‘crime’ as an event of which one must not speak. Patrocinium relates specifically to legal advocacy and open, public speech.

139 Merula’s interpretation is the one also found in William of Orléans’s Bursarii (see Engelbrecht, De Bursarii super Ovidios, 172).
140 For example A. L. Wheeler (Tristia. Ex Ponto (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1924), 5) translates the line, “My case is not a good one, and will prove too difficult for advocacy.” Note how translating it in this sense gives it a more personal tone (i.e. it is Ovid’s case we are talking about), while the other sense (Amerbach’s rendering) gives the line a more generalized, gnomic tone.
To provide an even more striking comparison between Amerbach and Merula, and in order to demonstrate the shift in emphasis of their respective pedagogical methods, let us briefly consider Amerbach’s own comments on *Tr.* 1.1.7, the same verse on which we consulted Merula’s commentary above.

Amerbach’s gloss on the word *cedro* merely reads: “He places ‘of cedar’ in the place of ‘from cedar oil’; see Pliny,” (*Cedreum ponit pro oleo ex cedro, vide Plin[ium]*). Where Merula was long-winded about the manifold uses for cedar oil and its production, Amerbach is content with a reference to Merula’s main source. This difference is characteristic of Amerbach: he eschews the encyclopedic approach taken by Merula. In fact, Amerbach rarely, if ever, employs the Ovidian text as an authority on matters of fact, or even as a springboard for their investigation. The reasons for this change include several possibilities. The first of these has been detailed by Ann Moss, namely that the general trend in Ovidian commentary from the late Quattrocento into the mid-1500s is a shift in focus from the encyclopedic to the rhetorical.\footnote{Moss, *Renaissance France*, passim. This is a trajectory that is largely corroborated by White, *Renaissance Postscripts*, 87-143, in his discussion of the Renaissance commentary tradition of the *Heroides* in France.} As evidence of this in the case of the *Tristia*, Moss produces the gap in the publication history of Merula’s commentary that occurs in France from 1520 to 1553, which suggests to her that a commentary like his was no longer *en vogue* among learners of Latin in
the second quarter of the 16th century. She attributes the decline in popularity to
the rise of commentaries that were more rhetorically focused in content.
Amerbach would certainly fall into this category.

I would like to stress, however, that this evidence does not necessarily
prove that commentaries like Merula’s were being supplanted by ones like
Amerbach’s. One only has to look at the commentaries to see that the more
elementary student of Latin would find Amerbach to be of little or no avail in his
learning. While Amerbach is still interested in grammatical explication, often his
analyses are at a more advanced level than those produced by Merula. The two
commentaries are different enough that they likely served different audiences—
audiences not just separated by half a century and differing tastes, but by
differing levels of proficiency as well.

This leads to the second possible reason that Amerbach jettisoned the
encyclopedic approach of Merula: Amerbach was writing his commentary not to
supersede that of Merula, but rather to complement it. The comment cited above
provides excellent evidence for this. Amerbach essentially summarizes Merula’s
long-form comment—‘cedro is cedar oil’—and offers the source of the material
that Merula reproduces on the topic. There is no need for Amerbach to expand:
such a commentary has already been written; to add more information would be
unnecessary, while to quibble over the details contained therein would be seen as
overly pedantic. Amerbach’s own words elsewhere make clear that he intended
for his work to serve as a counterpart to Merula. Take for instance his comments on *Tr.* 1.9\(^{142}\):

> Quod ad argumentum, et dispositionem pertinet, facilis est haec elegia: sed quod pertinet ad nomina locorum, quae sunt hic ursurpata, non habet prorsus nullam difficultatem. Verum nos, relicta posteriore, quod sic satis ab interprete sit agitata, priorem breviter pro nostro more tractabimur.\(^{143}\)

As far as the argument and arrangement is concerned, this elegy is easy: but concerning the names of places which are employed here, it holds no small difficulty. But I, leaving the latter behind, since they have been so sufficiently handled by Merula, will in short go over the former in my usual manner.

Amerbach is content to let Merula’s work on the matters of geography stand, and introduces his approval with the adverb *satis*. Such an approach toward Merula is typical for Amerbach: he is rarely adversarial, and when he is, his tone is more one of disbelief at Merula’s blunder than one of open hostility. Regardless of whether or not Amerbach wished for his commentary to be read alongside Merula’s, there is no doubt that it was utilized in such a way: the first reprinting of Amerbach’s commentary, published in 1550 at Basel, placed it side by side with Merula’s.\(^{144}\)

\(^{142}\) What was *Tr.* 1.9 at the time is now numbered as 1.10.
\(^{143}\) Amerbach, 19.
\(^{144}\) *P. Ovidii Nasonis Fastorum libri VI, Tristium V, De Ponto IIII, In Ibin.Cum commentariis Antonii Constantii Fanensis, Pauli Marsi, Bartholomaei Merulae, Domitii Calderini, Zarotti, multo... emendatius excusis. His accesserunt Enarrationes Viti Amerpachii, Jacobi Micylli & Philippi Melanchthonis Annotationes* (Basel: Joannes Herwagium, 1550). This also the case in the first French edition, *P. Ovidii Nasonis Tristium, commentariis Barth. Merulae, Viti item Amerpachii expositionibus illustrat[us]* (Paris: M. Davidis, 1553), number 184 in Moss’s check-list. This book contains only Book 1 of the *Tristia.*
2g. Addenda

The original 1549 edition of Amerbach’s commentary was accompanied by another of his works. Printed after the commentary are two orations written by Amerbach which render the poetic speeches of Ajax and Ulysses from Book 13 of Ovid’s Metamorphoses into prose. The presence of this work at the end of a commentary on the Tristia certainly raises questions about how we are to understand its presence. The two speeches are venues for Amerbach to demonstrate in practice the principles that he developed throughout his commentary. It produces a sort of reverse exercise, in which the student can read the orations and develop his own internal ‘Amerbachian’ commentary on the text, and potentially consult the original Ovidian passage as a comparandum and produce a similar analysis. These are meant to be supplementary exercises to Amerbach’s commentary, and not simply put in the edition on a whim. The speeches of Ajax and Ulysses from the Metamorphoses were already established as a locus classicus suitable for in-depth rhetorical analysis.145

3. Hercules Ciofanus (1545-1591)

We must now leap forward a generation to arrive at the last great Ovidian commentator of the 16th century, Hercules Ciofanus [Ercole Ciofano]. Ovid was in his bones; he too was born in Sulmona and was raised up breathing the same

---

145 The iudicium armorum ("judgment of arms") was a popular locus for focused commentary during the Renaissance. See Coulson, “Commentaries on the iudicium armorum.”
Abruzzo mountain air that nourished the ancient poet and hearing the popular folk stories which morphed Ovid into a magician and sainted convert.\textsuperscript{146} He pursued the study of Ovid with a single-minded determination and would eventually publish complete commentaries on all of Ovid’s works. A collection of his personal letters by which some of the details of his biography may be reconstructed are still extant.\textsuperscript{147} He was educated in Rome at seminary and La Sapienza. There he developed a friendship with Marc Antoine Muret (or Marcus Muretus) who would be influential in his introduction to the learned circles of the city, which included an introduction to Paulus Manutius and his son, Aldus the Younger. Aldus’ Venetian press would publish Ciofanus’ first major work, a commentary on the \textit{Metamorphoses}, in 1575.\textsuperscript{148} Ciofanus’ commentary on the \textit{Tristia} was printed first by Aldus in 1578, included in an Ovidian \textit{opera omnia} which collected all of Ciofanus’ commentaries on Ovid, along with his \textit{Vita Ovidii} and \textit{Descrip­tionio urbis Sulmonis}, which celebrated their shared hometown.\textsuperscript{149} The

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{146} Such stories are collected in Antonio De Nino, \textit{Ovidio nella Tradizione Popolare di Sulmona}, (Casalbordino, 1886).
\item \textsuperscript{147} These are contained in Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, MS Reg. lat. 2023, ff. 57r-103r. These are, as yet, unedited, and I am indebted to Ciofanus’ entry in the \textit{Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani} (vol. 25, 1981) for reproducing the salient details.
\item \textsuperscript{149} Herculis Ciofani Sulmonensis \textit{In omnia P. Ovidii Nasonis opera observationes. Vna cum ipsius Ovidij vita, & descriptione Sulmonis} (Venice: Aldus Manutius, 1578).
\end{itemize}
relationship between Ciofanus and Aldus soon soured after Ciofanus was left in financial straits, having been led to believe that, if he moved to Venice, Aldus’ press would have work for him. The relationship was further harmed by Ciofanus openly claiming that Aldus had stolen his minor work on Cicero’s *De Officiis*.

Through the intercession of the Spanish humanist Benito Arias Montano, Ciofanus’ complete Ovidian commentary was reprinted by the press of the Fleming Christopher Plantin beginning in 1581. Despite the new print run, it seems as though Ciofanus was never able to repair his financial situation, and his life spiraled into a series of misfortunes. In this troubled time, which left him “sempre da mendicare” (“always a beggar,” as one of his letters to Cardinal Sirlento states), the laments of the exilic Ovid likely seemed to resemble his own circumstances all too well. In fact, not long before his death, one may see him adopting Ovid’s exilic trope of a withering *ingenium* and applying it to his own poetic output: in a letter to Marino Ranaldo from 1590, he sends some Latin epigrams which he claims are “di povera vena” (“of poor inspiration”).

---

150 The *Tristia* commentary was one of the first in the production run; it is imprinted 1581. I will refer to it hereafter simply as ‘Ciofanus.’ Plantin had published Montano’s polyglot bible, now commonly called the *Antwerp* or *Plantin Polyglot.*
3a. Commentary and method: Ciofanus the textual critic

The most distinct feature of Ciofanus’ *Tristia* commentary is that he is far and away the most textually oriented critic of the major commentators, as well as the most systematic in his approach.\(^{151}\) We can see in Ciofanus the first concerted, though by no means complete, effort at producing a text of the *Tristia* by means of an organized examination of a wealth of manuscript sources. One of the most common types of comments throughout his work is the citation of variant readings from the manuscripts he had examined; however, beyond merely listing the variants (a feature that was present in both Merula and Amerbach, to some extent), Ciofanus actually records the owners and locations of the manuscripts which contain the particular reading which he cites.\(^{152}\) He makes clear in his dedication to the work that such a clarification of the text of the *Tristia* was one of his primary aims and he details the method by which he has pursued it:

*In quibus [libris], ut scis, tantum studii et otii posui, quantum mihi, in aliis rebus vehementer occupato, ad eos cum veteribus exemplaribus conferendos vix satis fuit.*\(^{153}\)

\(^{151}\) This is also the opinion of Moss (*Renaissance France*, 61), by whom he is given the briefest of mentions (since he is of little relevance to her overall project) and is infelicitously called ‘Hector’ Ciofanus.

\(^{152}\) The frequency at which these variants are provided is nowhere near commensurate with what we have come to expect from a modern edition; in his comments on the entirety of the first book of the *Tristia*, there are roughly 25 variant readings that are offered. This seemingly small number is still a significant departure from the earlier commentaries.

\(^{153}\) Ciofanus, 59.
In these books I have placed as much of my study and leisure time as I had, though greatly occupied in other affairs; scarcely was it sufficient for comparing them with older exemplars.

Furthermore, he continues:

*Illud saltem me consecutum spero, ut omnes fassuri sint, hosce libros, plane aureos locis aliquot emendatiores, illustrioresque, quam ante hunc diem, in studiosorum manus pervenire.*

I hope at least to have achieved this: that all shall soon admit that these books [the *Tristia*], clearly splendid, come into the hands of those eager to read them more correct in several places and clearer than they were before this day.

Through his work on his commentary, Ciofanus was ultimately responsible for the collation of a number of manuscripts of the *Tristia* contained in the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana that would come to be known in later editions as *Codices Vaticani* (*Cod. Vat.*), and would be employed by both Pieter Burman and Nicolaas Heinsius in their editions.154

Ciofanus employs a number of analytical methods in order to make judgments on the validity of variant readings. For a simple example, let us consider his comment on *Tr*. 2.85:

*CUNCTAQUE FORTUNA RIMAM FACIENTE DEHISCUNT: ISPA SUO QUADAM PONDERE TRACTA RUUNT.*] Sic in Maffei. In uno Vaticani ipsa suo quodam pondera tracta ruunt. Sed illud a in verbo pondera recens est, et

---

aliō atramento. Lege itaque vel, ut est in excusis quibusdam, Ipsa suo quondam pondere tracta ruunt.

EVERYTHING SPLITS OPEN WHEN FORTUNE MAKES THE FIRST CRACK / THESE CERTAIN THINGS THEMSELVES155 GO TO RUIN, DRAGGED DOWN BY THEIR OWN WEIGHT.] Thus it is in the Maffei manuscript. In one of the Vatican manuscripts [one reads] ipsa suo quodam pondera tracta ruunt. But the letter ‘a’ in the word pondera is recent, and in a different ink. Read it thus, or, as it is in certain print editions, Ipsa suo quondam pondere tracta ruunt.

Though not yet established as a formalized discipline, Ciofanus employs rudimentary palaeographical skills that have long aided editors of texts, here identifying that the reading in the Vatican manuscript he mentions is the result of a later scribe attempting to correct the troublesome verse. In this passage he also cites one of his other main manuscript sources for interrogating the text of the Tristia, a certain codex Maffeianus that he calls ‘Maffei.’156

From time to time, Ciofanus’ abundant suspicion of the text results in proposed readings which are not so well-grounded in the evidence supplied by his manuscript collation, but are born of dizzying displays of erudition. His gloss

155 I have translated the problematic text here literally, which makes little sense.
156 I am, as of now, unsure of the current location or status of this particular codex; however, the name ‘Maffeianus’ is given to other codices which belonged to the library of Cardinal Bernardino Maffei, and, possibly, those of his brother Achille. E. H. Alton ("A catalogue of the manuscripts of Ovid’s Fasti," Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies of the University of London 24 (1977), 43n31) catalogues a ‘Maffeianus’ containing the Fasti, Nux, Ibis, Med, Facei, De Med. Aurium, and Amores, which Antonio La Penna (Ibis. Prolegomeni, testo, apparato critico e commento (Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1957), cxxiv) claims is the one used by Ciofanus for his editions and commentaries. It is now in Ferrara. The most well-known Maffeianus codex is that of Cicero’s Philippics, now Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Ottob. lat. 1992 (see B. L. Ullman, "The Codex Maffeianus of Cicero’s Philippics," Classical Philology 30 (1935)), which contains a coat of arms belonging to the Cardinal.
on titulus in v. 6 of Tristia 1.1 is a good example of such an instance wherein

Ciofanus overcomplicates matters:


NOR A TITLE] Why he should say ‘titulus’, various are the opinions of learned men, none of which I approve. Therefore, I will not hesitate to toss into their midst what came to mind on this matter. I judge ‘titulus’ to be one and the same with ‘tutulus’: with ‘i’ changed to ‘u’ as in ‘optime’ ‘optume’, ‘maxime’ ‘maxume’, ‘lacrima’ ‘lacruma’. A ‘tutulus’ however, as Festus says, is the head ornament of the wife of a priest, which was a purple band, which is woven in the hair and piled up onto the top. For as the ‘tutulus’ is placed upon the woman’s head, so the ‘titulus’ is placed upon ‘brow’ of the books.

Such mental pyrotechnic displays can produce results which are less than satisfactory.

Ciofanus’s reputation among his peers was significantly helped by the great care he took to make sure that he also cited contemporary critics responsible for emendations. The number of 16th-century critics and commentators he draws from is large, and includes both Scaligers, Budé,

---

157 nec titulus minio, nec cedro charta notetur (“Nor may your title be inscribed in red, nor your pages marked by cedar oil”).

158 This concurs with the findings of Coulson (“Failed Chastity,” 29) concerning Ciofanus’s Metamorphoses commentary. Joseph Scaliger, if the Secunda Scaligerana is to be believed, once referred to Ciofanus as ‘an honest man,’ (“Ciofanus honneste homme. Il a bien escrit sur Ovide; il estoit sulmonensis comme lui,” 269) which was more than could be said about others in the trade of writing and publishing commentaries in the 16th century: I have already mentioned above Merula’s theft of Regius’s work on the Metamorphoses.
Turnebus, and his dear friend Muret, among others who are less well known. In doing so, Ciofanus has helped modern critics as well, as he is often the only record for many of these critics’ conjectures.

3b. Commentary and method: Ciofanus and comparanda

Ciofanus makes a statement concerning Ovid in his prefatory letter that underpins the way that he approaches the text of the Tristia for the purposes of commentary:

Quo temporis spatio id praestare conatus sum, ut OVIDIUS ipse, collatis ex eius praesertim operibus, innumerabilibus prope locis, sui ipsius interpres paene videatur.

In this span of time I have tried to show that Ovid himself, particularly when all of his works are gathered together, in a nearly countless number of places, he seems to be his very own interpres.

Ciofanus employs the term interpres in both senses of its meaning: it represents both the editorial and exegetical role of the commentator. To Ciofanus, Ovid is his own editor. By this, Ciofanus means that when the manuscript evidence fails to produce a text with sufficient clarity by his standards, his most profitable avenue for producing a manageable text is to turn to the entire corpus of Ovidian poetry in search of comparanda, wherein he might find similar expressions or grammatical constructions in order to confirm his reading of a particular line.
Apart from his collations of the Vatican manuscripts, this practice is Ciofanus’ primary editorial tool.

Simpler examples of this type of comparative textual analysis, which Ciofanus provides without a list of textual examples, are common; the commentator makes judgments about the accuracy of the text based solely upon his familiarity with Ovid’s style. Commenting on Tr. 1.2.73, he writes:


AND ME] one Vatican codex and the Aldine text [read] Ut mihi. I approve. Our poet is accustomed to using this and similar repetitions.

The passages which Ciofanus reproduces for comparison do not serve only the ends of the textual critic, but also those of the literary exegete. Often, a gloss on a line of Ovid’s poetry will contain no remarks from Ciofanus himself, but will only reproduce verses drawn from another source, primarily from poems within the Tristia and Ex Ponto. Through giving additional usages of similar sentiments and constructions, Ciofanus seeks to let Ovid explain himself, hoping that by showing the reader such points of comparison, the meaning of a passage will become clear. Citations from other authorities (e.g. Pliny, Ausonius, etc.) are still present, but they are not as dominant as they were in Merula’s text.

---

159 Ciofanus, 73.
160 Outside of citations of similar verses elsewhere in Ovid, Ciofanus tends to cite from Vergil and Martial. Such citations are far fewer in number than those described above.
Furthermore, citations of these *auctores* are nearly always made to explain matters of fact, be it cultural, historical, or mythological, rather than to explain Ovid’s meaning.

Ciofanus also keeps track of exilic tropes and metaphors with such citations. When Ovid writes at *Tr.* 1.1.13-14 *neve liturarum pudeat. qui viderit illas, / de lacrimis factas esse meis* (“Nor be ashamed of your smudges: should anyone see them, let him know that they were made by my tears”), Ciofanus reproduces four sets of verses from *Tristia* wherein the poet uses the trope that his writings have been marred by his weeping.\(^{161}\) He generates comprehensive catalogues of locations where Ovid employs the same metaphor; the lists he produces include poems from both the *Tristia* and the *Ex Ponto*.\(^{162}\) These can be seen as the precursor to such lists in the works of modern critics, and can aid the reader who wishes to analyze the text of the *Tristia* structurally or who seeks to investigate the development of common themes across either the exile works or Ovid’s entire oeuvre, since many of the *comparanda* are drawn from Ovid’s other works as well.\(^{163}\)

This sort of comparative reading of the *Tristia* is, to the best of my knowledge, a novel approach to the text at the time Ciofanus was writing his

---

161 Ciofanus, 63. The citations are, in the order presented: *Tr.* 3.1.15-16; 1.9.37-8; 5.4.3; 5.4.5-6.
162 For example, Ciofanus catalogues of Ovid’s use of *mea cymba* in his note at *Tr.* 1.1.85, citing *Tr.* 2.4, 2.8, 3.4, 5.2, 5.6, 5.8 and *Ex P.* 2.3, 2.7, 4.3, 4.8.
163 Such an impulse among the moderns can be found in Jo-Marie Claassen’s valuable lists of metaphorical usages in *Displaced Persons*, such as Ovid’s employment of illness as a metaphor for exile.
commentary. No such thing is found in Merula, nor in Amerbach: Ciofanus provided the commentary tradition on the *Tristia* with a unique and useful contribution. This sort of approach could represent the results of a shift in the way that Ovid was read: a synoptic view of the Ovidian corpus, with more attention paid to the interconnection between its constituent parts and increased interest in self-referential inter-texts. This sort of reading presents us with a view of Ovid that establishes him as a sort of über-auctor, in the sense that the only place one needs to turn to find answers for a question raised by an Ovidian text is to another Ovidian text. Ciofanus’ great familiarity with the text of Ovid’s poems, accrued through his collations of the available manuscripts of all of Ovid’s works, in combination with his deep pride in the poet with whom he shared a hometown, made him particularly disposed and well-suited to such a style of analysis.

164 This is not meant to suggest that this shift in reading is simply due to the new omnibus editions, since, as Richard Tarrant (“Ovid and Pseudo-Ovid, Nux," in *Texts and Transmission: A Survey of the Latin Classics*, ed. L. D. Reynolds (Oxford: Clarendon, 1983), 258) reminds us, already by the end of the 12th century omnibus editions “had become a popular alternative to the independent circulation of individual works.”

165 Furthermore, for modern readers, to see the poem read in such a way raises certain questions about the *Tristia* which involve us in one of the central paradoxes of the work. Is all of Ovid’s self-referencing part of his overall poetic programme? Can this be considered an effort on the part of Ovid to exert some degree of control over his reception? Throughout the *Tristia* one of the recurrent themes in the rhetoric of Ovid’s self-defense is that a poet should not be punished for a poem he writes because the poet and his poetic creation are not one and the same. The entire project of the *Tristia* seems to undercut this defense: his words are to stand as surrogates for himself where he cannot go, even going so far as to take on his exilic appearance (see *Tr*. 1.1 and 3.1—both programmatic poems), even when they themselves get to return to the Eternal City. In this sense, Ovid is transfigured into a different body: a corpus of literary works; he becomes his poetry. Reading Ciofanus’s commentary makes one acutely aware of just how much this is the...
3c. Commentary and method: Other commentary

Though the examples above make up a significant portion of Ciofanus’s comments, the standard types of grammatical and informational help one expects to find in commentary are likewise present. In general, the approach of Ciofanus to these matters has more in common with Merula than it does with Amerbach, though Ciofanus is by no means as exhaustive as the learned Mantuan. Ciofanus is still interested in providing geographical, cultural, and mythological explanations. These rely heavily on earlier auctores whom he often quotes in full, as opposed to simple citation by name. The great majority of his quotations come from Latin sources, but there are several Greek sources used as well, though he is much less likely to reproduce the actual Greek text in the body of the commentary, probably due to a perceived lack of familiarity with the language in his target audience. Ciofanus attempts to remedy this difficulty in his account of the story of Telegonus (at Tr.1.1.114), wherein he produces his own Latin translation of a Greek source, in this case a section of Oppian’s Halieutica (2.470-505), in dactylic hexameter “ut res magis intellegatur,” (“so that the matter may be better understood”).

---

166 Ciofanus, 68-9.
One of the more unique aspects of Ciofanus’s commentary that
distinguishes it from his predecessors’ is his use of Rome’s abundant
epigraphical evidence as a historical source. When Ciofanus cites an inscription,
he produces it in its entirety, formatted with dots marking empty spaces or
lacunae, and gives its location. When Ovid alludes to the *ludi saeculares* at *Tr.*
2.25-6, Ciofanus reproduces two inscriptions. With the first, found on the
Capitoline, he confirms the date of the games; the second, in the possession of
Fulvio Orsini, contains the text of a *senatus consultum* decreeing that the games be
held.

Ciofanus produces little in the manner of rhetorical or stylistic
commentary. Like Merula, he is content to identify the occasional rhetorical
figure, but these are all very simple (i.e. metaphor, alliteration, hyperbole).
Ciofanus does not evaluate Ovid’s arguments for persuasive method or judge
their effectiveness, as Amerbach does. His focus throughout remains on
establishing the text, providing *comparanda*, and increasing accessibility.

3d. Style

Ciofanus is not afraid to use the first person to claim a particular opinion
as his own. This is likely due to the full maturation of the role of the

---

167 *quo tempore ludos / fecit quos aetas adspicit una semel* (“in the time which he held the games which
an age looks upon only once”).
168 Ciofanus, 90.
commentator into an authority on ancient text in his own right, which had continued to develop throughout the 16th century. Nor is he afraid to claim that others are simply mistaken in their opinions. His belated position in the tradition means that he often takes a reactive tone: his commentary is peppered with such expressions as Merula lapsus est (“Merula erred”) and deceptus est Merula (“Merula was mislead”). His disagreements with Merula often involve the editing of the text, but he also differs on matters of interpretation. One such quibble shows a shift in the perceived chronology of the composition of the Tristia’s individual elegies. In his gloss on Ovid’s expression fera hiems (“savage winter,” Tr. 1.1.42), Merula had commented, “Erat enim in Scythica regione poeta: quae magnis frigoribus vexatur,” (“For he was in Scythian country, which is harassed by great cold”). Ciofanus claims that Merula is mistaken: “Aspera tempestas,” he writes. “Deceptus est Merula, qui aliter accepit. Hunc enim librum in itinere scriptum esse constat,” (“It is a harsh storm. Merula, who accepts otherwise, is mistaken. For it is certain that this book was written in his travels”). Merula implies that Book 1 is being written after Ovid’s arrival in Scythia, in a retrospective style, whereas Ciofanus’ use of constat, albeit for rhetorical effect,

170 Amerbach, however, is never mentioned.
171 Merula, f. 3r.
172 Ciofanus, 65.
shows that critical opinion had shifted toward the belief that Ovid had written the poems of Tr. 1 as a sort of diary while at sea. Ciofanus iterates this view to drive the point home in a comment on a later verse, nobis habitabitur orbis / ultimus (“The end of the Earth will be inhabited by me,” Tr. 1.1.128-9), wherein he asserts: Nondum enim in Scythiam pervenerat, (For he had not yet arrived in Scythia”).\(^{173}\) This all hinges on his quite literal reading of Ovid’s use of the future tense.

Worthy of note also, since it may tell us something about the intended audience of Ciofanus’s work, is his use of vernacular language in some of his glosses. Such glosses are not pervasive, and are seemingly only used when there exists some idiom in vernacular Italian that is similar to the Latin expression being glossed; for example, in a gloss on huius temporis (Tr. 1.1.4), he writes, “Nostra idiomate, Di questo travaglio,” (“In our idiom, ‘of such travail’).\(^{174}\) For curiosity’s sake, Ciofanus even includes a gloss in Polish(!); Ovid’s mention of a lake in Tr. 3.10, prompts Ciofanus to identify it as a lake not far from Kiev called ‘Owidove iezioro’ or ‘the Ovidian lake’ by the Poles.\(^ {175}\)

---

\(^{173}\) Ciofanus, 70.
\(^{174}\) Ciofanus, 62. Some other examples include a curious gloss on admonitus (‘messo per la strada, imboccato, averitto,’ 64), notes on videto (‘fa che consideri,’ 67), tua virtus (‘il tuo valore,’ 80), and meo candori (‘all mia schittezza integrita,’ 100).
\(^{175}\) Ciofanus, 111. Ciofanus’s sources for this information are his humanist acquaintances Paul Uchanski, who was the ambassador of the Polish King to Pope Gregory XIII, the orator and diplomat Jerzy Tyczynski [Georgius Ticinius], and royal secretary Sebastian Grabowieczki. Ciofanus claims that these men, and ‘others having knowledge of Polish matters and places’ have made him ‘rather certain’ of this. Ciofanus seems convinced that the locale of Ovid’s exile lay somewhere within the bounds of the contemporary Polish commonwealth; this belief was widely accepted.

88
We can view these vernacular glosses as potentially more than simple idiosyncrasies; perhaps they offer a deeper insight into the commentator’s mindset. Vernacular glosses present a direct parallel between the ancient Latin expression and the modern, popular tongue, bridging the gap between the two worlds. Furthermore, such glosses may be attempts to demonstrate the generality and universal applicability of the sentiments contained in the ancient work, an attempt to demonstrate their continued validity in the commentator’s contemporary world.

3e. Nachleben of the commentary

The notes of Ciofanus on the *Tristia* were included in the complete *variorum* edition which was printed at Frankfurt in 1601 (Marnius and Aubrius) alongside the remarks of both Merula and Amerbach. His commentary seems not to have crossed into France, despite his close friendship with Muret; this may be due to the lack of a market in France for commentaries which were heavily focused on textual issues. As I have mentioned above, Ciofanus’s collations and variant readings were important for the later editions of both Heinsius and Burman.

---

 propagated by the Poles, and for the results of this belief on the reception of Ovid in northeastern Europe, see the chapter on Polish poet Klemens Janicki below.

A side-by-side analysis of the commentaries of Merula, Amerbach, and Ciofanus will serve to further elucidate their respective methods of commentary. I have chosen Book 2 of the *Tristia* as the basis upon which to compare these three commentators largely due to its present popularity with modern audiences and its position as the most widely read portion of Ovid’s exilic corpus. The continuous flow of the book, written as a single elegiac poem, also makes for an easier point of comparison between three disparate commentators whose pedagogical interests largely differ. One might suspect that the uniqueness of this book-length elegy, couched in a collection of smaller ones, would have caused it to be treated differently in commentary than the other books of the *Tristia*, but this does not appear to have been the case; the commentators show no significant alterations in their various methods when dealing with it as opposed to any other book. For example, its highly rhetorical nature and apologetic verse do nothing to lure Merula into the rhetorical mode of commentary.

---

177 *Tristia* 2 has occasioned commentaries separate from the work as a whole among modern scholars, including that of Owen (*Tristium Liber II*, 1924) and the recent work of Jennifer Ingleheart (*Commentary*, 2010).
In sum, Book 2 is not singled out for any sort of special treatment by our Renaissance commentators, and it is considered by them to be merely another portion of the work as a whole. There is no evidence that the second book of the Tristia circulated separately in the 16th century: its demarcation as a segment of the work which stands out from the main body and its separate circulation are habits of modern practice.178 Focusing upon it here, therefore, runs little risk of producing an unrepresentative sample of commentary.

1. Lemmata

The first and most obvious place to begin a comparison between a group of commentaries is through an examination of their lemmata.179 By looking at the lemmata that a commentator chooses to produce, (and perhaps more importantly for present purposes, reproduce,) issues of both scholarly rivalry and deference to authority can be revealed.180 In gathering my data, I have counted lemmata as being the same (that is, as a lemmatic reproduction) when they comment on the same area of the text and contain at least one word in common; they sometimes

---

178 The first instance of the Tristia being printed in anything but its entirety occurred in 1553, but this was a commentary on Book 1 (a composite edition with the commentaries of Merula, Amerbach, and Jacobus Micyllus, printed in Paris). The 1572 publication of Thomas Churchyard’s English translation The Thre First Bookes of Ovid’s De Tristibus, translated into Enlishe (London: Marshe, 1572) again saw the Tristia divided up, and rather strangely so, in that it was a translation of only three of the Tristia’s five books.

179 A brief and useful discussion of the importance of lemmatic analysis for the study of commentary can be found in Christina Shuttleworth Kraus’s introduction to Gibson and Kraus, The Classical Commentary, 10-20.

180 Ibid., 13.
do not match up in their entirety, word for word. This is due to the fact that the commentators provide lemmata of differing lengths: Merula’s tend to be shorter (likely due to the large volume of commentary and the fact that the text of the poem is present upon the page), while Ciofanus (whose commentary is less extensive and present without the text) tends to excerpt whole lines. The discursive nature of Amerbach’s commentary makes locating lemmata much more laborious. When found, they are often taken from the beginning of a line, followed by an ‘etc.’ that refers to an undetermined and varying amount of text which should be understood to accompany the lemma.

The general size of lemmata is an important distinction between commentators, since the ‘chunks’ of text that are lemmatized say something about the way the commentator (to use Glenn Most’s terminology) ‘atomizes’ the text, dividing it into what he views as being the most essential and least divisible element of the text. These selections reflect the philological aims of the commentary and have an impact upon the way in which the subject text of the commentary is read. Merula’s short lemmata of single words and small phrases are indicative of his intent to pen a commentary which is more analytical and concerned with minutiae of the text. This format also renders his work the most useful for a classroom environment, as the comments are encapsulated entities

181 Glenn W. Most, *The Measures of Praise* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1985), 36-7. To Most, the lemmata are the ‘atoms’ produced via the choice of the commentator, or his ‘atomization’ of the text.
that stand on their own and are easily identifiable. They can be used or ignored at the whim of the student or the instructor, which further suggests that, to Merula, the text of Ovid’s *Tristia* serves as the primary work, while his own commentary is placed in a secondary, auxiliary position. A reader would have a harder time utilizing his commentary, as many often do, in a backwards fashion, that is, beginning from reading the commentary and then referring to the text.

Amerbach’s selections, on the other hand, reflect his intent to produce a more synthetic and discursive discussion of larger sections of text. He intentionally blends the lemma into his commentary, disguising it as part of his discussion of the work. This aspect of his work lends it to a more ‘illicit’ reading of the text which begins from the commentary and proceeds to the text. Ciofanus, in his frequent reproduction of whole lines and couplets, displays his concern with the constitution of the text, since a textual variant’s ‘correctness’ can only be determined within its full context.

A detailed examination of our three commentators, focusing both upon the reproduction of lemmata and content within their commentaries, provides the following data. The highest correlation of lemmata (by which I mean that the commentators have glossed the same word(s) or line(s) of text) exists between Merula and Ciofanus, who share a total of forty-five instances in Book 2. Despite

---

182 This is further reinforced by the print layout of Merula’s 1499 edition, which prints topical finding aids in the outer margin, rendering it much more useful to a piecemeal or ‘hit-and-run’ usage of the commentary.
this agreement upon what they think is worthy of their scholarly attentions, the content of their glosses is found to be in agreement (i.e. saying the same thing or corroborating each other) in only seven instances. This demonstrates that, even though they often comment upon the same things, the content varies greatly between the two works and is often at odds. This fact harmonizes with the content of Ciofanus’ commentary and shows how he still viewed himself in competition with the reputation of his Venetian predecessor even at nearly a century’s remove: a common refrain throughout his work is ‘*Merula lapsus est,*’ (‘Merula slipped up’). Such a reproduction of lemmata, when accompanied by a disparity in commentary content, highlights the tension between tradition and originality that is deeply imbedded in the entire genre of commentary. The Renaissance commentaries on the *Tristia* are no exception.

Merula and Amerbach share a little over half as many places (27) where such a coincidence of lemmata occurs; of these, eleven show a general agreement of content. This higher percentage of agreement is consistent with the conclusions that I previously made concerning Amerbach’s attitude towards Merula’s commentary: Amerbach, writing in a different style of commentary and for a different (more advanced) audience, saw his own work as supplementary to
that of Merula. Indeed, this is the way in which the work was received in France, where it was reprinted in a volume alongside Merula’s commentary.\textsuperscript{183}

Amerbach and Ciofanus, however, have far less in common. If indeed the number of shared lemmata is a valid criterion for measuring the influence of one commentary upon another, one may conclude that Ciofanus made no real use of Amerbach’s commentary in his own work: their Book 2 commentaries share only four lemmata. Furthermore, only one of these glosses vaguely ‘agrees.’ This instance occurs in Amerbach and Ciofanus’ respective glosses at \textit{Tr.} 2.115: both commentators suspect a corruption in the text.\textsuperscript{184} The fact that the both Amerbach and Ciofanus share this suspicion is a simple coincidence, however, and not a sign of influence, since Ciofanus was more than capable of identifying the textual problem on his own, independently of Amerbach.

All three commentaries gloss the same portion of Book 2 in only three places, and there is no place in which the contents of all three commentators agree. Logically, this indicates that three of the four instances of shared lemmata between Amerbach and Ciofanus also exist between Merula in Ciofanus, leaving only one real instance in which Ciofanus’ lemma matches that of Amerbach independently of Merula; this fact demonstrates even more clearly that Amerbach had no impact on the commentary of Ciofanus. Despite the popularity

\textsuperscript{183} This is number 184 in Moss’s ‘Checklist of Editions’ (\textit{Renaissance France}, 75).
\textsuperscript{184} This comment is discussed in more detail below in the section 3 on textual criticism.
of Amerbach’s commentary in the mid-16th century in France,\textsuperscript{185} it would appear that his influence on the reading of Ovid’s \textit{Tristia} in Italy was negligible. This is corroborated by the printing history of Amerbach’s commentary. Though the rise of Amerbach’s work rivaled that of Merula in central Europe in the mid-16th century (as Ann Moss details), among the Italians, Merula nevertheless reigned supreme for more than three-quarters of a century.\textsuperscript{186} This also highlights geographical and temporal differences in the reading and study of Ovid that developed during the sixteenth century, such as those which Moss has previously outlined: Italian scholars of Ovid never developed the rhetorical tastes of their northern neighbors. Though, as I mentioned in the previous chapter, the difference in each commentary’s intended audience may account for much of this apparent divergence in approach. For the present purpose—the study of the \textit{Tristia}—it is difficult to do more than generalize with a sample as small as three commentaries.

\textbf{2. Introductory material to Book 2}

The commentators’ introductions to Book 2 reflect their approaches to the work as a whole and demonstrate their individual commentary styles. Each begins their commentary as follows:\textsuperscript{187}

\textsuperscript{185} This was discussed in the previous chapter.
\textsuperscript{186} Moss (\textit{Renaissance France}, 21).
\textsuperscript{187} Lemmata are capitalized, separated by an end bracket (}).
Merula:

*QUID MIHI VOBISCUM EST*] Precatur Augustum Ovidius ut si non reditum velit, mitius tamen ac tutius exilium concedat, dicitque se tentare si forte carmina quae illi antea nocuere nunc possint salutem reddere quemadmodum Achillis hasta, quae Telephum et vulneravit et sanavit. Longo igitur et artificioso carmine conatur Caesarem placare, ostendens se multa de eo scripsisse, enumeratque poetas alios quamplurimos qui nunquam ulla clade affecti sunt, quamvis mordacia aut turpia poemata ediderint.

WHAT IS THERE BETWEEN YOU AND ME] Ovid begs Augustus that, if he does not consent to his return, he should at least concede a less harsh and safer place of exile, and says that he will try to see if perchance the songs which previously harmed him might now be able to bring safety, in the same way as the spear of Achilles, which both wounded and healed Telephus. Therefore, with a long and skillful poem he tries to placate Caesar, showing that he himself has written many things about him, and lists numerous other poets who never suffered a downfall though they published critical or base poetry.

Amerbach:


This book is a single elegy, and it is written to Augustus Caesar. The poet, however, tries copious and diverse means either to placate or soften the offended emperor. The elegy has frequent complaints, frequent petitions, excuses and consolations. However, as I have said, it particularly belongs to the *genus deliberativum*, like a great deal of such a work does. With these preliminaries out of the way, I will now recite individual portions in order, and add, as is my custom, explanations, when they will seem necessary.
Ciofanus:

CARMINA FECERUNT, UT MORESQUES NOTARET IAM PRIDEM INVISA\(^{188}\) CAESAR AB ARTE MEA.] Duas ob causas Augustum odiosum sibi reddidit poeta; altera, quod libros De arte amandi edidit; altera, quod eum in re turpi atque obscena inscius deprehendit. lib. IV. De Ponto elegia XIII.

Carmina nil prosunt, nocuerunt carmina quondam,

*Primaque tam misera causa fuere fuga.*

Lib. III. eleg. V huius operis.

*Inscia quod crimen viderunt lumina, plector;*

*Peccatumque oculos est habuisse meum.*

Et eleg. VI.

*Nec breve, nec tutum, quo sint mea dicere casu*

*Lumina funesti conscia facta mali.*

*Vide quod dixi in ipsius poetae vita.*

MY SONGS MADE IT SO THAT CAESAR LONG AGO TOOK NOTE OF ME AND MY CHARACTER ON ACCOUNT OF MY HATEFUL ARS.] The poet brought the hatred of Augustus on himself by two causes: first, the fact that he published the *Ars Amatoria*, and second, that he unwittingly caught him in a base and obscene act. Ex. P. 4.13:

My songs did me no good, then they hurt me:

they were the prime cause of so miserable an exile.

And elegy 3.5 of this work:

That my unknowing eyes saw the offense, I lament;

my fault is to have had eyes.

And elegy 6:

It is neither brief nor safe to speak by what chance

my eyes were made conscious of that calamitous evil.

Look at what I have said in the poet’s life.

---

\(^{188}\) There is a textual problem here. The reading printed in modern editions replaces *iam pridem invisa* with *iam demi iussa*, the reading contained in the two most reliable MSS of the *Tristia*. I have translated the text printed by Ciofanus.
Merula places his introduction to the book following an extraneous lemma to maintain the format of the commentary. That the lemma is unnecessary is evidenced by the fact that the comments which follow have nothing to do with the verse, and this same lemma (quid mihi vobiscum est) is repeated for a second time following the introductory remarks to begin the commentary proper.\textsuperscript{189} Merula provides a generalized interpretation of the content of Book 2 which is a slight elaboration on the traditional \textit{argumenta} found in earlier commentaries: it is the plea of Ovid for a milder place of exile and a lament over his harmful pursuit of poetry.\textsuperscript{190} It is worth noting that here too Merula avoids the details of the cause of Ovid’s exile. As I have previously stated, Merula seems little concerned with the scurrilous speculations of previous generations, and hardly mentions them at all. Here he only implies that Ovid’s literary works were to blame by mentioning the defense that Ovid makes within the poem by claiming

\begin{small}
\textsuperscript{189} The comment on this repeated lemma is explanatory and contains a prose reordering: \textit{Apostrophe est ad libellum. Est autem ordo...} (‘It is an apostrophe to his book. The order is...’), f. 17r.
\textsuperscript{190} For example, ‘Arnulf I’ (f. 1v): \textit{hic incipit secundus liber qui ad Augustum dirigitur, in quo ei Ovidius supPLICat ut aliquantum ira eius remittatur et de suis libris conqueritur a quibus abstinere velit.} (‘Here begins the second book, which is directed towards Augustus, in which Ovid begs him to let go of his anger to some degree, and laments concerning his literary works, which he wishes to avoid’); ‘Arnulf 2’ (f. 2r): \textit{Hic incipit secundus liber quem scribit ad Augustum ut ei parcat, et se de arte amandi excusat} (‘Here begins the second book which he writes to Augustus so that he might spare him, and he makes excuses for the \textit{Ars Amatoria}’); William of Orléans (a bit more judgmentally): \textit{Hic incipit secundus liber in quo nulla est distinctio, quem mittit ad Augustum pretendens causas et excusationes erroris sui, sed ut liberius descendat ad preces Augusti, prius conqueritur de studio ex quo damnacionem consecutus est, dicens: Quid michi.} (‘Here begins the second book, in which there are no divisions, which he sends to Augustus alleging reasons and excuses for his error. But in order that he may more freely sink to begging Augustus, he first laments concerning the pursuit from which he received his damnation, saying ‘Quid mihi’’) (text from Engelbrecht, \textit{De Bursarii super Ovidios}, 18).
\end{small}
that other poets have written “critical or base poetry,” (*mordacia aut turpia poemata*) and remained unpunished.

Most characteristic of Merula is his inclusion of an explanation of a mythological reference to the wound of Telephus and his subsequent restoration with the aid of the spear that harmed him. This myth, which Ovid obscurely references at *Tr.* 2.19-20 (*Teuthranta regna tenenti* = Telephus), serves as a metaphor for the whole of Book 2. Merula prematurely clarifies what the reference means, but does so because he understands how integral this story is to Ovid’s presentation of Book 2. He could have easily waited to clarify the myth at his gloss on *Teuthranta regna* a few lines down.191 Merula marks out for the reader the importance of this myth for Book 2, while also setting the encyclopedic tone for the commentary which follows by including such a reference in his introduction to the book.

Amerbach begins from the same place as his predecessor, but his *argumentum* is more succinct: the book is an unbroken elegy written to Augustus. He then enumerates the several features (see *variae*) of Ovid’s style which Book 2 puts on display. The terms which he uses are specific rhetorical tools and *topoi*

---

191 *TEUTHRANTA REGNA*] *Mysiae regna quae tenuit rex Teuthrantus, qui virili stirpe carens Argipen filiam Telepho despondit, eumque reliquit regni successorem* (“Teuthrantian kingdom] The realms of Mysia which were held by king Teuthrantus, who, lacking a male successor, gave his daughter Argiope to Telephus in marriage, and left him as the successor to his kingdom”), f. 17r. Merula’s earlier mention of Telephus in the introductory remarks prepares the reader for his comment here, allowing him to only mention Telephus by name. He then also has no need to explain verse *Tr.* 2.20, *res eadem vulnus opemque feret* (“The same thing may wound and aid me”).
(petitio, excusatio, consolatio), which are listed to focus the reader’s attention upon these features of the Tristia and to suggest that one ought to prepare a heading in one’s notes for listing each instance of such a feature when it is encountered in the poem.192 Amerbach places the book beneath its appropriate heading in the rhetorical taxonomy, claiming that it, like a great deal of the Tristia, belongs to the genus deliberativum.193 Amerbach then outlines the method by which his commentary will proceed (which, curiously, he does not provide at the beginning of the whole commentary) and his choice of words is telling. First, he chooses the verb recitare to describe his actions: a strong indicator of an intended oral format for the presentation of his commentary. Second, Amerbach claims that in his comments he has exercised his personal discretion (ubi videbitur opus esse). This statement brings the persona of the commentator to the fore in a way that is rarely seen in Merula; he puts on display the authorial power which he wields over the text in his position as the arbiter of what is worthy and unworthy of discussion.194 Discretion is an important to Amerbach’s method: he will not comment on anything and everything, as Merula’s commentary had already
done that. This statement further shows that Amerbach did not view his own work as comprehensive, but rather as a supplement to earlier commentary, particularly the more exhaustive Merula.

The opening remarks made by Ciofanus at the beginning of Book 2 hardly constitute an introduction and are meant only to clarify the lemmatized phrase. Absent are an argumentum and other such generalities. Though these are missing, his comment does provide a pseudo-introduction that relates back to the medieval accessus in his choice to provide details on the reasons for Ovid’s banishment. Ciofanus differs from the medieval commentators, however, by confining his reasons to the generic: Ovid wrote the Ars; he saw Augustus doing something damaging. He speculates no further on either of these statements, and refuses to elaborate on what exactly Ovid saw; he leaves out salacious fantasies such as Augustus committing incest with his daughter. Most importantly, unlike the majority of earlier accessus, Ciofanus provides the relevant passages from the Tristia and Ex Ponto in full citation. This use of full citation for corroboration of his comments is the standard operating procedure for Ciofanus: he uses Ovid’s corpus as the ultimate source for information about Ovid. This

---

195 This is unlike the instance concerning Merula above, where the introduction to the book follows an unrelated lemma.
196 See Hexter (Ovid and Medieval Schooling, 106).
197 This is one-third of the ‘familiar trio’ of offenses, per Hexter, Ovid and Medieval Schooling, 125. See n. 87 above.
198 The medieval accessus provides proposed solutions to the reasons behind Ovid’s banishment, but generally does not provide the arguments which produced them. See n. 86 above.
199 For more on this practice, see Coulson, “Hitherto Unedited I” and “Hitherto Unedited II.”
is admirable, on the one hand, due to his intent to stick close to the source and remain skeptical about details added from elsewhere in the author's tradition, while removing radical interpolations from the poet's *vita*. But, on the other hand, it remains problematic, in that it still reduces Ovid's literary work to verse autobiography. Nevertheless, it must be said that the restraint shown by Ciofanus in his refusal to let imagination run away with his preferred subject matter is admirable. From such an opening to the book—traditional, yet radically altered in content and method—it is clear that Ciofanus sees himself as a reformer of traditional scholarship.

3. Textual criticism

I have made general remarks concerning the attitudes of each commentator towards establishing and emending the text of the *Tristia* in the previous chapter, and here I intend to elaborate upon these assertions by providing parallel examples of the commentators grappling with the text. To recapitulate briefly, Ann Moss's observations that, in general, commentators of this period pay slight attention to textual matters until the latter part of the 16th century largely holds true in this case: it is not until Ciofanus that a commentator make a dedicated effort fully to establish the text. Merula and Amerbach, it must be said, are not entirely disinterested in textual criticism, but both men fail to pursue it with the systematic approach and intellectual rigor of Ciofanus.
Merula is willing to emend the text, but only when he deems it absolutely necessary. He prefers, rather, to attempt to explain away the difficulty when he encounters a text that does not make sense. His particular interest in ancient geography only encourages this approach when the textual problem comes in the form of a botched place name. Such an instance is found in his remarks on Tr. 2.191 (Ciziges et Colchi Tereteaque turba Getaeque, a line which has puzzled modern editors as well):

\[
\text{METEERAQUE TURBA] Aut urbem Meteream eam intellege, quam Ptolemaeus supra Thyram fluvium ponit penes Daciam et Metonium appellant, aut certe Neurea legas, ut Neuros intellegas apud quos oritur Borysthenes, ut est autor Plinyus. Neurorum meminit, etiam Curtius, Pomponius, et Dionysius.}
\]

THE METEREAN MULTITUDE] Either understand it as a city, Meterea, which Ptolemy places above the river Dniester belonging to Dacia and called Metonium, or certainly you may read ‘Neurea,’ meaning the Neuri, among whom the Dnieper originates, as Pliny says. He recalls the Neuri, as do Curtius [Rufus], Pomponius [Mela], and Dionysius [of Halicarnassus].

Such a textual problem as this presents Merula with an opportunity that is too good for him to pass up, since he may here employ textual criticism and the encyclopedic teaching method in tandem. This particular comment leaves one
with the impression that Merula is far more interested in elaborating the various inhabitants of ancient Ukraine (not to mention showing off), than solving the textual problem. Nevertheless, this example demonstrates the tools which Merula utilizes to suggest his emendations. Quite often, as is the case here, they rely upon intimate *factual* knowledge from other ancient sources. This means that a great many of his conjectures arise when he encounters an incomprehensible proper noun, since adequate solutions to these textual difficulties often require the type of geographical, historical, or mythological information that Merula is so keen to collect. In other words, he emends where he feels most qualified to do so.

When it comes to the ‘Meterean multitude,’ Amerbach is of very little help indeed. He too senses the problem, but is unable to provide a solution, either because he does not possess the geographical knowledge of Merula, or, more likely, because he cares very little about finding it. Such an attitude is evinced by his casual dismissal of the problem: “In this spot,” he writes, “I change none of the names of the tribes, though ‘the Meterean multitude’ is an expression unknown to me...” (*Ubi muto nihil in nominibus gentium, quanquam Meterea turba, vox mihi incognita sit*). Amerbach is content to let the name stand even though it lacks familiarity, suggesting that he was well aware of his limitations when it came to divining a conjectural reading in such a case. The emphasis of his commentary on this verse falls on the rhetorical significance of the tribes, and the

---

203 Amerbach, 27.
elaboration of the reason that Ovid used such an expression: whoever and wherever they are, Ovid employs them as an indicator of his location on the fringes of the empire, to mark his distance from Rome.\textsuperscript{204} The textual concern plays only a minor role, and admittedly, the single mysterious toponym has little bearing on understanding the passage.

But what about instances in which emendation would have a greater effect on the poem and its meaning? At times, the motivation behind Merula’s commentary, namely, his desire to render the text readable and comprehensible to the lower-level Latin student, can effect Merula’s judgment and lead him to make alterations where none is necessary. It creates a preference for variants that render the poem too simple and flatten Ovid’s use of metaphor. Take, for example, the following comment on Tr. 2.473-4, \textit{quid valeant tali, quo possis plurima iactu figere, damnosos effugasque canes}, ("what value the dice show, how you can fix them with your throw on the most points, and you may avoid the ruinous dogs"): 

\textit{FINGERE] Ego vincere legendum esse arbitror, aut certe fingere componere et formare plurima puncta uno iactu. Superior sententia magis placet.}

\textit{TO PRODUCE] I think one must read vincere, or certainly fingere — to make up and to fashion the highest amount of points in one throw. The latter sense is more pleasing.}\textsuperscript{205}

\textsuperscript{204} \textit{...dicendo significet magnum spacidum, in extermitate Imperii Romani, ("...in saying this, he signifies a vast distance, in the reaches of the Roman Empire"), ibid.}

\textsuperscript{205} f. 28r.
Amerbach provides a suitable rebuttal that speaks to Merula’s error. Amerbach here displays his own critical qualities by providing corroborating evidence from other authors that the expression should not be changed:

_Ubi miror, quare interpres pro figere, censuerit scribendam vincere, aut fingere, cum apta sit metaphora propter ablativum ‘iactu,’ sumpta vel a sagitariis, vel a venatoribus, pro lucrari, aut vincere in hoc aleae certamine: sicut ferae vincuntur iactibus, et figendo. unde hoc etiam est Vergilii, figere cervos: hoc est, confodere, aut punctum caedendo, ut Livius loquitur, interficere: sicut a nobis dicitur ‘ein pern stechen.’_

In this place I wonder why Merula thought that *vincere*, or *fingere*, must be written in place of *figere*, when the metaphor is fitting on account of the ablative *iactu*, taken from either archery or hunting, in the place of profiting or winning in this dice contest; in such a way wild beasts are conquered with throws or shots, and transfixed. Whence, too, comes Vergil’s ‘to transfix deer,’ that is, to stab them through, or to kill, as Livy says, ‘by striking with a point,’ just like we say ‘*ein pern stechen*.’

Amerbach makes good use of parallels from Vergil and Livy, while taking note that Ovid’s choice to use the word *iactus* suggests a context of hunting. But most importantly, it is Amerbach’s greater rhetorical awareness, and particularly his sensitivity to metaphor, which functions here as his text-critical tool. It is little wonder that a scholar such as Amerbach, who comes to Ovid as a source for the teaching of rhetoric, would seek to avoid the pitfall of simplifying Ovid’s expression, when a deeper, more figurative meaning could be preserved. In this

---

206 Amerbach always refers to Merula as _interpres_.
207 Amerbach, 35. Merula perhaps cannot be faulted too greatly, as this sense has escaped at least one modern scholar as well: A. L. Wheeler, in his note on this line in his Loeb translation, writes: “_Figere (fingere?) is a technical term not occurring elsewhere_,” (90).
example we can see how the instructional approaches of the two commentators towards the *Tristia* exert an impact upon the way in which they scrutinize the text.

All of this is not to imply that Amerbach is entirely lacking in corrections which hinge upon simple grammatical elements as well. One example of such a correction comes at *Tr.* 2.77, when he encounters the phrase *nimium crudelior* (which should read *nimium crudeliter*). He writes, “*Quod ibi nimium adiungit comparativo crudelior est observandum. alioqui enim positivo tantum fere adiungitur,***” (“That he here joins *nimium* to the comparative *crudelior* is worth noting, since, generally, it is only joined to the positive degree”). He offers no correction, but points out a grammatical anomaly that brings the text into suspicion.

One may compare to these examples the critiques that Ciofanus makes in Book 2. Corrections and variant readings are greater in number (as one might expect), but when he provides them, the accompanying discursive material is decidedly less. Ciofanus finds his solutions in his collations, and this evidence is generally sufficient for him. At *Tr.* 2.115 there is a textual problem, and Amerbach sensed it first in his commentary. The verse, now printed as *sit quoque nostra domus vel censu parva vel ortu* (“Even though my house is small in wealth and pedigree”), read in Amerbach’s source (likely Merula’s edition), *sic quoque.*
Amerbach only points out that it is an expression which “hardly seems to cohere with what precedes.” Ciofanus comments:

\[ SIT QUOQUE \] Ita legendum, veterum librorum auctoritate et ratione; id est, et quamvis nostra domus parva sit etc.

\[ EVEN THOUGH IT IS \] Thus it must be read, by the authority of the old books and by the sense; that is, ‘Even though our house is small, etc.’

Often a single mention of the ‘old books’ is sufficient explanation for Ciofanus, and with this term he refers to an unspecified number of his Vatican codices. He is sometimes more detailed, however, and provides a specific manuscript as his source for a variant. When he supplements his mention of the \textit{libri veteres}, Ciofanus is just as likely to mention a contemporary scholar as his source as he is to name an ancient author, as demonstrated by his note on 2.460, \textit{[scit] cur totiens clausas excreet ante fores} (“[He knows] why one coughs so often outside the locked doors”):

\[ SCIT CUI LATRETUR, CUM SOLUS AMBULET IPSE, CUI TOTIENS CLAUSAS EXCREET ANTE FORES] In libro Maffeiano, et aliis quibusdam

---

208 \textit{duriuscule videtur cohaerere cum praecedentibus}, (Amerbach, 26). The MSS sources from which this reading stems are known, recorded in the modern editions, giving us some hint about the source(s) Merula may have been using for his own edition. These are given the sigla \textit{A}, \textit{G}, \textit{H}, and \textit{P} in Owen’s OCT.

209 The reading Ciofanus is critiquing has \textit{cui} for \textit{cur}. Merula’s edition prints \textit{cui}. I reproduce here the list of contemporary critics, commentators, and printers referred to by Ciofanus throughout the commentary: Antonius Carolus Aquilanus, Petrus Angelius Bargaeus (a man with some interesting— for lack of a better term—ideas about the state of statuary in Rome), Christophorus Clavius Bambargensis, Guilielmus Budaeus (Budé), Petrus Crinitus, Paulus Melissus, Bartolomeus Merula, Marcus Muretus, Alexander Paganinus, Julius Parrhasius, Christophorus Plantinus, Julius Caesar Scaliger, Joseph Justus Scaliger, Ambrosius Pius Sulmonensis, and Adrianus Turnebus.
veteris exemplaribus, rectius omnino legitur cur totiens etc. ut legendum esse iam docuit Doctissimus Scaliger Iunior.

HE KNOWS AT WHOM HE BARKS, WHEN HE IS SKULキング ALONE, FOR WHOM HE COUGHS OUTSIDE THE LOCKED DOORS] In the Maffei manuscript, and in certain other old exemplars, it altogether rightly reads cur totiens etc. as the most learned Scaliger the Younger has already taught that it must be read.210

4. Shared commentary

There are only a few areas of Tristia 2 upon which all three commentators write glosses, and in none of these do all three say the exact same thing. Instances of overlap between two of the commentaries are far more common. The following section will examine a small sample of these areas where multiple commentators remark upon the same portion of text.

4a. All three commentators

Where all three of our commentators discuss the same portion of Tristia 2, we have the best opportunity to truly view Merula, Amerbach, and Ciofanus side-by-side. One of these rare instances comes at verses 2.85-6, a distich which has long remained contentious:211

210 It is uncertain what exactly the form this teaching of Scaliger’s was in when Ciofanus encountered it. We know that Daniel Heinsius’s edition of the Tristia (published after Ciofanus’s commentary) included with it select notes by his teacher Joseph Justus Scaliger. Also, it is possible that Ciofanus and the younger Scaliger were acquaintances, since in the 1560’s, he traveled to Rome and met Marc Antoine Muret, who introduced him to scholars in the city. Muret, of course, was one of Ciofanus’s closest friends.

211 I print the verses here as they appear in Merula, and have offered a translation that attempts to follow his comments on the distich. These two verses are deleted by both Roverus and Heinsius;
Cunctaque fortuna rimam faciente dehiscunt,
   Ipsa suo quaedam pondere tracta ruunt;

All things gape open when Fortune makes a crack,
   The house itself falls by its own weight, while certain other things
   are dragged along.

The comments are as follows:

Merula

CUNCTAQUE DEHISCUNT] Omnes domus partes aperiuntur. IPSA SUO
Quaedam tracta ruunt: id est quaedam cadunt proprio pondere nec possunt stare,
quaedam vero partes ipsius domus ab aliis tractae labuntur. Per domum autem
quassatam [a phrase from 2.83] se ipsum designat; per omne onus [from 2.84]
tellegit odium cunctorum quod contraxit carminis lascivia. Per eum autem qui
domum concutit, Augustum designat. Per fortunam rimam facientem denotat
eiusdem Augusti potentiam; per suum pondus accipe Ovidii crimen; per partes
vero tractas se odio etiam amicorum exulasse profitetur.

ALL THINGS GAPE OPEN] Every part of the house is laid open.
CERTAIN THINGS THEMSELVES BY THEIR OWN] This is the order of
things. The things themselves: that is, the very parts of the house go to
ruin by their own weight. Some things, dragged along, go to ruin: that is,
some things fall by their very own weight and are unable to stand, while
some parts of the house itself, however, fall down because they are
dragged down by others. Moreover, through the battered house, he
signifies himself; through the whole burden, he means the antipathy of all,
which he obtained by the wantonness of his poem. Moreover, through the
one who struck his house, he means Augustus. Through Fortune making a

Luck prints them in brackets. Owen emends suo quaedam to suoque eadem (on the suggestion of J.
P. Binsfeld, Questiones Ovidiane criticae I, (Bonn, 1853) translating eadem as 'likewise'), producing
a strange elision, but one which is not without precedent (see semperque eadem at Tr. 4.15.29). On
this emendation see Owen, “On some passages of Ovid’s Tristia,” CQ 8 (1914), 23. The MSS
sources produce several variants (including quodam and quondam, see Ciofanus below) which can
easily be viewed in any of the modern critical apparatus.
crack he marks out the power of the very same Augustus; through its own weight, understand Ovid’s offense; through the dragged parts, however, he professes that he was made an exile by the hostility even of his friends.

Merula begins, sensibly, with a paraphrase followed by a prose reordering—the two primary tools of his explanatory method. Merula’s chooses limited and elementary vocabulary (omnis for cunctus, the more common and prosaic aperio for dehisco) as he fills in the gaps left in the reader’s understanding by the terseness of Ovid’s expression (i.e. the neuter ‘things’ modified by cuncta are actually partes domus). The interpretation that he provides for his edition’s text (ipsa suo quaedam) seems to be the only way to make the sentence comprehensible. He suggests that ipsa and quaedam must be understood separately from each other, as though there were a pause inserted after suo.

Merula then indulges in the unpacking of Ovid’s metaphor by means of an allegorical approach which produces clear-cut parallels: the house is Ovid; the burden and the weight his house bears up is the infamy which his scandalous poetry has won him; Augustus is represented by the power of fortune which makes the crack that causes the whole to come tumbling down. Such a cut-and-dry interpretation of the metaphor is reminiscent of medieval allegorical approaches, and is somewhat uncharacteristic of Merula, who generally prefers to simply point out metaphor rather than interpret it.212

212 The most well known Latin allegorization of Ovid’s work was the Ovidius Moralizatus written by the French monk Pierre Bersuire (1290-1362) — a work whose influence is best known through
In this particular case, Merula may have been led to offer an interpretation simply because one was already provided in the extant *Tristia* commentary from the Middle Ages, which he was content to reproduce with his own slight additions. His words greatly resemble those of the ‘Arnulf 2’ commentary, which reads: *FORTUNA* per fortunam, *id est*, Augustum (“FORTUNE] through fortune, that is, Augustus”) and *IPSA SUO* libris ipso me ruentem odio habebam (“THE VERY THING BY ITS OWN] I consider myself ruined by the very ill-will towards my books”). While it is entirely plausible that Merula could reach such similar interpretations on his own, it is the rarity of such interpretations in Merula’s commentary that throws up a red flag, and suggests that he may be pulling such content from earlier commentary when it is available to him.

Merula adds two further distinctions not present in ‘Arnulf 2’: the house’s ‘own weight’ (*suo pondere*) represents Ovid’s mistake (presumably the famous, elusive *error*, rather than the *carmen*); the ‘dragged parts’ (*tracta*) are his friends who chose to follow Augustus’s example and shun him. The first of these additions suggests that Merula desires to interject a bit of personal responsibility back into the narrative of Ovid’s demise, while the second is unlikely to be

---

the works of Chaucer. The lasting effects of the allegorical and moralizing style of reading Ovid in the Renaissance are treated by Ann Moss, *Latin Commentaries, passim.*

213 Cambridge, University Library MS Add. 4456

214 f. 104v.
entirely original, since it expresses a sentiment very similar to the one found in the commentary of William of Orléans.²¹⁵

**Amerbach**

Et statim addit valde pulchram et appositam allegoriam, quae est generalis sententia. Quasi dicat, cum aliquis impellitur a fortuna, et incipit ruere, nihil manet integrum, totus cadit. Est autem repetitio praecedentis sententiae in versu ‘CUNCTAQUE FORTUNA, ETC.’ ac intellegit ita per domum se prolapsum, per quassatam, et fortunam – ipsam fortunam potius, quam Augustum, qui fuit tantum instrumentum fortunae ad hanc rem. Per tracta, et ruentia sua sponte, non tam peccatum Ovidii, quam contra innocentiam, ut illa etiam in magno casu non sit tuta. Atque hoc est, quod etiam vulgo dicimus, ‘Nulla calamitas sola.’ Posset etiam non incommode, ut existimo, ad Augusti personam hoc referri, ut esset sensus: deficiente a nobis principe, aut potente, omnes deficiunt, ac tale quiddam videntur praeceedentes et sequentes bini versus postulare. Quanquam Ovidius videtur hos duos sensus commiscuisse.

And immediately he adds a very beautiful and apposite allegory, which is general in its sense. It is as if he were to say that when someone is struck by fortune, and starts toward his ruin, nothing remains intact, the whole collapses. There is, moreover, a repetition of the preceding sentence in the verse ‘CUNCTAQUE FORTUNA, ETC.’ and he understands himself in the ruined ‘house,’ by way of its being struck, and in ‘fortune,’ fortune itself rather than Augustus, who was so great an instrument of fortune in this matter. By way of the ‘dragging,’ and the ruination ‘by its own will,’ [the verse represents] not so much the wrong-doing of Ovid as, to the contrary, his blamelessness, as even it was not safe in his great downfall. And this is

²¹⁵ Adhuc [sic] est eadem metaphora, quasi dicat: Multociens contingit, quod paries ita ponderosus quod ruina sua totam attrahit domum. Ita ira te tanta fuit in me, quod alii secuti sunt ea. Facta enim maiorum mutant minores (‘[To this point] the metaphor is the same, as if he were to say: ‘It often happens that walls are so weighty that in their own collapse they drag along the whole of the house. Such was your anger against me, that others followed your example. For the behaviors of greater men transform lesser men’’). The text is Englebrecht’s (De Bursarii super Ovidios, 182); translation is my own.
like that expression we commonly use, ‘There is no such thing as a lonesome calamity.’ It is possible, and entirely fit, as I see it, to bring this back to the character of Augustus, so that this would be the sense: when our princeps or his power is unavailable to us, all things fail; such a thing seems to be laid out in the preceding and following two verses.\textsuperscript{216}

In his use of the terms \textit{pulcher} and \textit{appositus}, Amerbach highlights that Ovid’s rhetoric succeeds here on two levels: first, the passage produces effective and evocative imagery (as \textit{pulcher}, in its most basic sense, is a visual term); with the second of these terms (\textit{appositus}, referring to the rhetorical concept of apposition) he denotes the appropriateness of the extended metaphor in its function as an explanation for Ovid’s situation, marking the passage out as a type of extended epithet.\textsuperscript{217} If the ultimate goal of reading the \textit{Tristia} is to be imitation of its style, such instances must be clearly highlighted for the student and Amerbach does so.

In his interpretation of the passage as allegory, it seems at first as though he will follow Merula’s recapitulation of the medieval commentators, since he clearly identifies Ovid’s \textit{fortuna} as representative of Augustus. Amerbach, however, makes an abrupt and unique turn, placing himself in opposition to the earlier explanations. To Amerbach, Ovid’s expression \textit{suo pondere} (“by its own weight”) is not representative of his critical \textit{error} (as it was for Merula), but rather

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{216} Amerbach, 24.
\item \textsuperscript{217} On the term \textit{appositum}, see Quintillian 8.6.40-3.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
its complete opposite: his innocence and reputation, which was ruined by the prince’s behavior towards him.\textsuperscript{218}

Amerbach then offers a reading of the allegory far more nuanced than Merula’s. Amerbach sees the crumbling house as representative not just of Ovid’s downfall, but of a prospective life lived without Augustus, wherein, without the support of the prince’s forceful personality, all things crumble. In this analysis, he shows a great understanding of the \textit{Tristia’s} poetic project and its themes. His interpretation of the verses makes them fit with the theme of Ovid’s withering poetic ability: Augustus is denied to him, so he can no longer write effectively. This claim bolsters Ovid’s defense that he has written often and in praise of Augustus by showing that the Emperor is integral to his poetic projects.

Amerbach’s reading also recognizes this passage as an excellent representative of the \textit{Tristia’s} dual and contradictory nature: in a simple metaphor, Ovid has fashioned a pathetic lament about his own guilt and his ruination at the hands of Augustus; at the same time, he praises the instrument of his misfortune with flattery that expresses a deep and personal relationship of dependence.

To return briefly to the more modern editorial debate over whether these lines ought to be deleted, Amerbach’s adept interpretation offers a sound argument for avoiding their total deletion, since it shows just how well the

\textsuperscript{218}This interpretation fits with remarks that Amerbach makes throughout his work concerning Ovid’s exile; on which, see section 6 below.
metaphor fits in with the motifs of the *Tristia*’s second book. Amerbach’s presentation of the metaphor’s richness is a far worthier line of reasoning for retaining the verses than the most recent critical judgment on the matter. In her commentary on Book 2, Jennifer Ingleheart reluctantly allows the lines to stand, conceding the point that “as it [v. 86] stands, it lacks any connective, but otherwise fits the hackneyed and feeble sententiousness of these lines.” Just how hackneyed and feebly sententious these verses are is a matter of taste; Amerbach, contrary to Ingleheart, highlights both the repetition and general applicability of the image in his comments, presumably to point out its positive rhetorical effect. The latter argument is far more sound and compelling.

Ciofanus


AS IT FALLS, SOME PARTS FALL BY THEIR OWN WEIGHT, WHILE OTHERS ARE DRAGGED ALONG] Thus it is in the Maffei manuscript. In one Vatican manuscript [one may read] *ipsa suo quodam pondere tracta*

---

219 Ingleheart, *Commentary*, 112.
ruunt. But the ‘a’ in pondera is recent and in a different ink. Rather, read it thus, or as it is in certain printed editions, ipsa suo quondam pondere tracta ruunt.\textsuperscript{220} ONCE] [in the sense of ποτέ] ‘whenever’; ‘generally,’ as in many examples. Vergil at the end of the sixth Eclogue.... And Aeneid 2, concerning Hector.... In the very same book.... If there is anyone who likes the other reading better, i.e. ipsa suo quaedam pondere tracta ruunt, thusly should it be divided and ordered: Some things go to ruin dragged by their own weight. This separation was demonstrated by the most renowned Muretus, the most educated and most noble of my friends, Antonius Carolus Aquilanus, and Ambrosius Pius of Sulmo, a most noble youth.

Ciofanus immediately latches onto the problem with the text. He provides sources for the text he prints in his lemma (the same text as Merula’s edition), and offers a variant from his collations. He puts his critical skills on display in an exercise of early palaeography, ruling out pondera after an analysis of ink and handwriting.

A further variant is added, this time from uncited printed books, a practice which is not uncommon for Ciofanus. He then must make sense of quondam in the variant reading, which he does with citations from Vergil.\textsuperscript{221} He at last reaches his explanation of how to understand the lemmatized line, and his interpretation is very much like that of Merula, separating quaedam from ipsa and understanding it as the subject of its own clause. But Merula is nowhere to be found on Ciofanus’ list of contributors for this particular solution: pride of place

\textsuperscript{220} This is the reading taken up by Heinsius, despite what Owen (1924, 137) calls “indifferent manuscript support.”

\textsuperscript{221} These same citations have been reproduced in modern commentary, including that Owen (\textit{Tristium Liber II}, 1924) and Ingleheart (\textit{Commentary}, 2010).
goes to his friend Muretus, who, as I have mentioned, was instrumental in
getting Ciofanus’ work published. Ciofanus’ squeezing Merula out of the picture
here is indicative of the sense of rivalry which I alluded to earlier.

Ciofanus puts the text-critical material in the foremost position of the
comment, leaving what some (like Merula above) would consider the most
fundamental part of the commentary—how to understand the verse—until the
very last. Furthermore, he completely forgoes the inclusion of any interpretative
material regarding the poetry. There is no mention of the extended metaphor, its
quality, or its meaning. In instances such as this, Ciofanus’s commentary
functions more as a discursive *apparatus criticus* than anything else.

4b. Merula and Ciofanus

I remarked above that while Merula and Ciofanus have the highest
correlation of glossed sections between them, their rate of agreement in what
their comments actually say is relatively low (roughly 15%). The small number of
instances in which these two scholars do make the same comments on a
particular verse is due to the similarity of the ancient source material. A good
example of this, and one which will also provide excellent contrast between the
two commentators methods, is found at Ovid’s mention of Iasion at *Tr.* 2.300 (*in Cererem Iasion*):222

---

**Merula**

IN CEREREM IASIUS]223 iasium filium

---

**Ciofanus**

IN CEREREM IASIUS, QUI REFERATUR, ERIT] lib. III Amor. eleg. IX.

‘Viderat Iasium Cretea diva sub ida.’

Higinus de Geminis: Nonnulli etiam Triptolemum et Iasiona a Cerere dilectos, et ad sidera perlatos aiunt.

---

I have discovered Iasion was the son of Abantis, king of the Argives. There was also an Iasius in whom this poet understands the son of Jove and Electra, and the brother of Dardanus and Harmonia, who took Cybele as a wife and fathered Corybantus, from whom the Corybantes are named. From Iasion, moreover, and Ceres, Plutus was born, the stories say. In fact, it holds that for Iasion’s grace, Ceres conferred as a gift upon him an

---

222 The entire couplet (vv. 2.299-300) reads: *in Venerem Anchises, in Lunam Latnium heros, / in Cererem Iasion, qui referatur, erit* (“Anchises will cause her to think on Venus, Endymion on Luna, Iasion on Ceres”).

223 Thus it reads in a great number of the MSS.
abundance of grain at Harmonia’s wedding. The source is Diodorus. Dionysius of Halicarnassus writes that Iasion, as he ardently sought sex with Ceres on the isle of Samothrace, was struck by lightning and killed. Hyginus also writes that Iasion was loved by Ceres and placed among the stars. Ovid in Met. 9: ‘gentle Ceres laments that Iasion has grown old.’

I have reproduced Merula’s comment in its entirety to demonstrate its sheer exhaustiveness in comparison with the trim appearance of Ciofanus’, and to highlight further the developments in the commentary tradition which had taken place over the course of the century. Merula begins with Iasion’s identity (something that Ciofanus leaves out): this is the simplest level of explication required for understanding the verse. This is where Merula always begins, before moving outward, increasingly widening his compass and offering progressively more complete information. He first provides a mythic genealogy, giving the reader the full background to this single obscure figure. Then the mythological anecdotes begin, each building into the next, as Merula gradually accumulates his mass of information towards a culmination which will clarify the line in question and result in the full explanation of Ovid’s meaning. The two important pieces of information for a complete understanding of Tr. 2.300 are the last two he provides: Ceres loved Iasion, and Iasion was killed by Jove for sleeping with

---

224 5.48.2.  
225 Astronomica 2.22.
her. Both of these tidbits explain why Ceres and Iasion are on Ovid’s list of ancient stories that will corrupt the twisted female mind, but are harmless when encountered by the chaste and prudent reader. Iasion’s death by lightning for sleeping with a goddess explains his juxtaposition with Anchises and Venus (as well as with Endymion and Luna) in the verse: the men were struck down by Jupiter, a fate meant to recall Ovid’s own punishment at the hands of the new Jove, Augustus. Merula lets his extensive use of mythological sources explain the poem by implication, rather than asserting the poetry’s meaning in his own authorial voice. This is a much more traditional approach towards commentary, allowing the weight of the sources to explicate the meaning of the text, as opposed to the commentator’s individual judgment.

Ciofanus’ comment shows that despite the fact that his commentary shares much with Merula in terms of what is commented upon, there is little affinity between their interests and approaches. Ciofanus cares for textual parallels since they are useful for his editorial purpose. They are what he gives pride of place, pushing explanatory and sense-making information into a secondary role. His own clarification of Iasion’s presence in the line utilizes far fewer sources, but it is noticeable (compared with Merula) that he has chosen to provide a more detailed citation and a verbatim quote from Hyginus’ text. He

---

226 In light of this analogy between the Ovid of the Tristia and figures like Iasion and Anchises, it is hardly surprising that earlier readers of the Tristia had developed elaborate speculations about hypothetical sexual escapades which ultimately caused Ovid’s demise.
does this even at the cost of including the superfluous and potentially confusing reference to Triptolemus, who is not present in the passage of the *Tristia* that he is glossing.

5. Use of ancient sources

Merula, Amerbach, and Ciofanus vary greatly in their use of ancient source material in terms of which authors they employ, how they are cited, and for what purposes. The following discussion is limited to citations of sources other than Ovid himself unless otherwise noted. As one might expect, Ovid’s own works are often used by all three commentators as a touchstone throughout their commentaries.

Merula is by far the most source-heavy of the three commentators. He produces both the most citations of the ancient authorities, and cites the largest number of individual authors, running the gamut from Appian to Zosimus. Among these authorities there are common household names, as well as some obscurities.\(^\text{227}\) His use of authors who were, at the time, discovered relatively recently (like Columella, for example, whose works had resurfaced in Switzerland only c. 1415, and were first printed in the 1470’s) suggests that

---

\(^{227}\) Authors cited in his commentary on Book 2 alone include: Acron, Appian, Apuleius, Callistratus, Catullus, Censorinus, Cicero (*Pro Flacco*), Columella, Q. Curtius Rufus, Diodorus Siculus, Diomedes Grammaticus, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Donatus, Fabius (likely Fabius Pictor as cited in a later historian), Gellius, Horace, Hyginus, Julius Capitolinus (*Hist. Aug.*), Justinus, Macrobius, Oppian, Pliny the Elder, Plutarch, Pompeius, Pomponius Mela, Ptolemy, Quintilian, Seneca (both), Servius, Solinus, Strabo, Suetonius, Tacitus, Tibullus, Valerius Flaccus, Valerius Maximus, Vergil, and Zosimus.
Merula was actively consuming new source material and had the means to obtain it.²²⁸

A glance at the list of cited authors shows that Merula relies heavily upon grammarians, historians, and geographers for the information contained in his digressive glosses, and that he is far more likely to make use of prose sources than poets. This is, of course, due to Merula’s interest in relating matters of fact to the reader. Citations in Merula come in both paraphrase and verbatim versions, though the first is far more common, usually marked out by a parenthetical \textit{ut scribit} or \textit{aut or} followed by the name of the source. Direct quotations are hard to distinguish, as they are not marked out from the body of Merula’s text. His heavy reliance on ancient authorities makes Merula seem more ‘medieval’ than the other commentators, in that his authorial presence as commentator largely disappears into the compendious collection of authoritative information.

Amerbach contains the fewest citations, both in number and authors utilized.²²⁹ The author whom he cites most often is Vergil. Amerbach generally resorts to the ancient authorites concerning issues of grammatical usage (his

²²⁸ Interestingly, the first full edition of Columella’s \textit{De re rustica} was published at Venice in 1472 by Georgius Merula, whom I have suggested in the previous chapter may be connected to our own Merula. On Columella see Virginia Brown, ed., “Columella,” \textit{Catalogus Translationum et Commentariorum} 3 (1976).

²²⁹ The list for Amerbach’s Book 2 commentary is much smaller than that of Merula and includes: Aristotle (in Greek), Catullus, Cicero (\textit{De Oratore}), Ennius, Gellius, Homer, Lucretius, Pliny (Elder), Plutarch, Propertius, Seneca (Younger), Tibullus, and Vergil.
source of choice for such matters is Aulus Gellius) and style (as in his citation of Vergil in section 3 above). Hence, he strikes a fair balance between citations of prose authors and poets. He occasionally cites other poets to corroborate a particular sentiment expressed in the *Tristia*; such citations are meant to provide evidence for the validity of Ovid’s chosen expression and to point to the general applicability of the glossed verse, marking it out as an appropriate commonplace expression to be recorded by the student. An example of this is his citation of Catullus’s famous lines, *nam castum esse decet pium poetam / ipsum; versiculos nihil necesset* (“for it is fit that the poet be chaste himself, not necessarily his trifling verses,” 16.5), when he encounters *Tr.* 2.353-6. Direct quotations from authors (such as this one) are not common, but when they do occur, they are drawn from poetry.

Ciofanus cites more ancient authors than Amerbach, but nowhere near the number present in Merula. The overall number of citations is quite large, however, especially considering the shorter length of the commentary. This means that Ciofanus produces citations quite often but generally only from a select group of authors. The authors included in this frequently cited group are

---

230 *crede mihi, distant mores a carmine nostri – / vita verecunda est, Musa iocosa mea – / magnaque pars mendax operum est et ficta meorum: / plus sibi permisit compositore suo* (“Believe you me, my character differs from my songs—my life feels shame, my muse is full of jest—the greatest part of my work is lies and fiction: more is permitted to it than to its author”).

231 The list of ancient authors cited by Ciofanus in Book 2 includes: Aelian, Pseudo-Apollodorus, Ausonius, Donatus, Horace, Hyginus, Justinus Lucan, Lucretius, Martial, Pliny (Elder), Priscian, Propertius, Quintillian, Silius Italicus, Solinus, Suetonius, Tibullus, and Vergil.
all poets of hexameters, epigram, and elegy, (the most common being Vergil, Propertius, and Martial,) and are used to point out parallel usage of words and phrases that Ovid employs in Tristia 2. Given Ciofanus’ textual interests, they are also employed to produce corroborating arguments for variant readings which he has discovered in his collations.

Citations from poets are produced in full, offset from the rest of the commentary with an identification of author, book, and poem. Prose authors are infrequently cited, and when they are, it is only rarely that they are quoted verbatim. The prose sources which Ciofanus uses fall easily into three distinct categories. First are the grammarians (like Donatus or Solinus, for example), who are employed for resolving issues of usage of single words rather than any conceptual grammatical argument. Second are historical sources, whence he draws what little historical and cultural information which he includes; their number is dwarfed by the number of such sources in Merula, and he relies heavily on Suetonius’ Lives of the Caesars. It is worth noting as well that his citation of the more obscure Justinus (the epitomizer of Pompeius Trogus’s Philippic Histories) is taken directly from Merula, and not indicative of Ciofanus’s usual practices. The third group are mythological sources, which are, again, scarcely present. His mainstay in matters of myth (other than Ovid’s own Metamorphoses) is Hyginus, followed by the occasional mentions of Pseudo-Apollodorus’s Bibliotheca (cited in Greek), and the Varia Historia of Aelian.
Ciofanus, it should be mentioned, cites the works of Ovid more than either of the other commentators, utilizing Ovid’s numerous other poems as a key to deciphering and understanding the contents of the *Tristia*, both conceptually and textually.\(^{232}\) Ciofanus’s commentary appears at a glance to be a large collection of quoted sources; it is just that they come by and large from Ovid himself.

6. Attitudes towards Ovid’s exile in the commentary on Book 2

One prominent mode of reading the *Tristia*, which is evident both in the medieval commentaries and has persisted into modernity, is the historical approach.\(^{233}\) The *Tristia* was commonly viewed as a biographical work that supposedly provided its reader with accurate information about the poet’s life and historical circumstances. Certainly the presence of poem 4.10, ostensibly a poetic biography, did much to encourage this approach. The work as a whole was often scoured to find bits of information about the reasons for Ovid’s exile and the historical circumstances surrounding it, and such a historical outlook towards the poetry greatly impacted the way in which it was read: for instance there is no evidence that any of the poems of the *Tristia* were ever allegorized, since, to the interpreter, there was no fictional element to which it was necessary to lend real-world significance; the poems were already ‘real.’ Ovid’s downfall

\(^{232}\) I discussed the implications of this in Ch. 2, pp. 79-81, esp. n. 165.

\(^{233}\) Syme, *History in Ovid*, is a modern example.
and suffering provided teachers with an effective enough model by which to demonstrate the vicissitudes of human fortune with no need for further interpretation.

The ways in which the commentators present these historical ‘facts’ of Ovid’s exile are worthy of note, since from their individual attitudes toward this event we can glean how they viewed the poet as a historical entity. The contents of Tristia 2 make it an excellent place to look for such revealing passages in the commentary. There are clear differences in sentiment among the commentators, particularly when it comes to the question of whether or not Ovid deserved to be punished.

Merula’s comments provide evidence that he believed Ovid was sent to the edges of empire only on account of his poetry, and he accepts the Ars Amatoria as the primary cause of Ovid’s troubles. In Merula’s estimation, Ovid is the guilty party for having written poems that were intolerable to the man in power. He avoids any speculation on other possible offenses.234

Merula continually reminds the reader of the Ars Amatoria throughout Ovid’s defense in Tristia 2. For example, when Ovid charges that the games and the theater can lead women to depravity just as much or more than his poems (2.277-290), Merula adds, almost as a counter-point, that Ovid himself is a poet who has written about the theater as a locale for improper interactions with

---

234 Concerning these, see section 1 in the previous chapter.
women, writing “De theatris in Arte Amandi ita scribit Ovidius ipse,” (“Ovid himself writes about the theaters in the Ars,” f. 22v) followed by a citation of Ars Amatoria 1.90 and 1.99-100.235 Ovid’s mention of gladiatorial contests as ‘peccandi causam’ (Tr. 2.81), prompts Merula to remind the reader,

Ludi etiam gladiatorii fuere causa ut multae peccarent: id quod etiam Ovidius in Arte Amandi docet, qum ait: ‘Hos aditus Circusque novo praebebit amori, / Sparsaque sollicito tristis harena foro.’

Gladitorial contests, too, were the cause of many woman sinning: this is what even Ovid teaches in the Ars Amatoria, when he says: ‘The circus too will provide opportunities for new love affairs, / the sad and scattered sand of the worrisome ring,’ (f. 22v).

Merula’s choice of docet in this instance carries a particular sting. The word brings with it echoes of the very charges that Ovid claims were leveled at him: that he was a teacher of immoral, adulterous behavior.

Merula’s deep interest in the Tristia by no means involves coming to the poet’s defense. It is uncertain whether Merula’s citations are meant to intentionally undermine the poet’s argument, but he does Ovid no favors in reproducing them. Merula, of course, was also Venice’s resident expert on the Ars, having completed a commentary on the work in 1494, so his quotations may also be a form of subtle self-promotion. Whether intentional or not, however, the

235 Haec loca sunt voto fertiliora tuo.... / Spectatum veniunt, veniunt spectentur ut ipsae: / Ille locus casti damna pudoris habet (“These locales are more fruitful for your desire.... They come to see, and be seen: that place is the grave of chaste modesty”).
placement of these lines from Ovid’s prior work side by side with his defense in Tristia 2 renders its rhetoric feeble and leaves it ringing all too hollow.

The reader of Tristia 2 who utilizes Merula’s commentary, then, will potentially develop a view of Ovid as the guilty party, and recognize that Augustus was right in punishing him. One has to wonder how much of this attitude hinges upon the fact that Merula was, in his position as a tutor, a man who was utterly dependent upon the patronage of the powerful and responsible for the upbringing of young aristocrats who were expected to defer to authority. Ultimately for Merula, however tarnished his reputation, Ovid’s guilt takes nothing away from his poetry, as the Tristia can still serve as a wellspring of pertinent information about the ancient world—his primary reason for using it as a pedagogical tool.

Amerbach is, on the whole, far more favorable in his depiction of the historical Ovid.236 When it comes to the poet’s punishment, the reader gets the impression that Amerbach believes that Ovid was treated unfairly by a corrupt prince. His opening remarks to Book 2 (reproduced above) make no mention of Ovid’s poetry at all, nor the traditional list of potential errors which Ovid could have committed to earn Augustus’s ire. He only mentions that the emperor was annoyed (Imperatorem offensum).237

236 I alluded to this above, when discussing Amerbach’s interpretation of the metaphor of the crumbling house at Tr. 2.83-86.
237 Amerbach, 22.
Amerbach looks at the situation surrounding Ovid’s punishment with a far more skeptical eye, and has a cynical outlook concerning the way that affairs are conducted within the halls of power. When Ovid laments, “Cur aliquid vidi?” (“Why did I see something?” 2.103), Amerbach explains,

*Ibi, cum dicit, CUR ALIQUID VIDI, ETC. claré significat Ovidius, quod non tam propter opus de Arte amandi conscriptum, sit relegatus quam quod viderit, et quidem casu, quod Augustus voluerit esse occultissimum: sive ipse Augustus, sive alius, ei cognatus, aut carus, hoc fecerit. Ac ita solet accidere, præsertim ubi fuerit res cum potentibus, quod vulgo dicitur, ut canem caedas, facile invenies baculum.*

There, when he says, ‘Why did I see something, etc.’, Ovid clearly indicates that he was relegated not so much on account of the fact that he wrote the work *Ars Amatoria* as the fact that he saw something, and indeed, accidentally, which Augustus wished to hide: either Augustus himself, or another person close to him, or dear to him, performed this act. And thus it commonly occurs, particularly in matters which deal with the powerful: as they commonly say, to beat a dog, you can easily find a stick.

Ovid’s error, in Amerbach’s analysis, was just that, an error, made unwittingly and without malice (*et quidem casu*). His depiction of the situation hints at a corruption of the regime in his portrayal of Augustus as a cover-up artist (*occultissimum*). Amerbach, the professor of rhetoric, indulges in a little suasive practice himself, ending his comment with a generalizing (and somewhat comical) statement about the practices of powerful men, casting Ovid in the role of a dog—a not entirely flattering comparison, but nevertheless an animal reputed for obedience. Meanwhile, Augustus by default becomes the abusive
master, arbitrary in his punishment, and thereby guilty of perpetrating a miscarriage of justice.

In the comments which accompany the middle section of Book 2 (wherein Ovid defends himself on the grounds that other poets have written similar works and not been so harshly punished), Amerbach is even more explicit. He says, concerning the *Ars Amatoria*,

\[ \text{dicam, uno aut altero loco tantum excepto, qui sunt obsceni, vix tamen obsceniores quam hae res a medicis tractantur, aut aliis aliquando sine reprehensione; hos libros multa egregie de moribus et virtutibus monere, multis exemplis, historiis, fabulis, et aliis pulcherrimis ornamentis refertissimos esse. Hinc facile mihi persuadeo, non hunc, sed aliam causam fuisse, cur Ovidius tam duriter a Caesare tractaretur.} \]

I will say that, aside from only one or two places which are obscene, they are scarcely more so than the matters discussed by doctors, or by others at other points, who did so without blame; these books offer much excellent advice concerning morals and virtues by many examples, historical and mythical, and are simply brimming with very beautiful figures. Hence, I am easily convinced that it was not for this work, but for some other reason that Ovid was treated so harshly by Augustus.\(^{238}\)

Amerbach even goes so far as to produce points for Ovid’s defense, taking on the role of his advocate, when he adds to Ovid’s point that to ‘teach love’ is not against the law (*non...legum contraria iussis, 2.243*) by asserting, “*amare per se non sit res turpis in natura,*” (“To love, in itself, is not a base thing in nature,”).
Overall, the reader is left with the sense that Amerbach sympathizes with the Ovid of the Tristia. It is not impossible that Amerbach’s more jaded outlook concerning dealings with powerful men was the product of his recent life experiences, which included his falling out with Martin Luther and his exodus from Wittenberg.

Ciofanus’s commentary on Book 2, unfortunately contains no other discussion of Ovid and his exile, outside of the material contained in the brief introduction presented above.

Conclusion to the Commentary Chapters

The methods and interests of the major Renaissance commentators of the Tristia are illustrative of broader developments in humanist commentary on Ovid.239 They present a trajectory of commentary that begins from an antiquarian encyclopedism with links to the medieval tradition, moves towards an emphasis on rhetoric, and by the latter part of the 16th century, is focused on establishing a reliable text. If the commentaries are an appropriate index, the Tristia was valued by its 16th-century readership first as a repository of knowledge about the ancient world and its practices that served as a springboard by which to access all facets of classical learning. In the middle of the century, the Tristia became the locus of

239 As they have been demonstrated by Moss (Renaissance France), Fritsen (“Renaissance Commentaries on Ovid’s Fasti,” and White (Renaissance Postscripts).
suasive techniques and tropes to be used for Latin composition, the knowledge of which permitted the reader to evaluate the arguments of others. By the end, concerns extraneous to the text are almost eschewed entirely, and what does remain of them in the body of the commentary appears little more than a vestigial remainder taken on from earlier commentary. One may see that over the course of this development at each stage the scope of the commentary becomes more focused, and, in a way, more philological. Furthermore, we can see the emergence of work that is more explicitly authorial, as the role of the commentator over the century comes more and more to the forefront: Merula’s voice is largely drowned by the mass of full text citations and appeals to the ancient auctores; Amerbach recognizes his role as the arbiter of what is and is not worth comment, which results in a more slender volume of commentary as he exerts his authority over the Tristia by choosing not to try to elucidate every facet of its varied wisdom; Ciofanus, in constituting a text based on a systematic critical method becomes the most authorial of all in his role as the fabricator of the text itself. Unlike their medieval predecessors, and despite some claims to Classical poetry’s ability to instill morals (see Merula), the Tristia’s Renaissance commentators are uninterested in linking Ovid’s poems to a fixed moral framework; ethical issues and morality are not entirely absent from the discussion, but no one is explicitly condemned by an all-pervasive moral code.

\[240\] For instance, one may consider Merula and Amerbach’s respective attitudes towards Ovid’s
that permeates the commentary. Generally the tone in such discussions is one of
civil neutrality. In a way, this frees the commentaries in general, since they are
not constrained with the need for moralization, allowing them to present the
study of the poems largely as its own end.
CHAPTER 4: A POLISH POET IN OVIDIAN EXILE: KLEMEŃS JANICKI’S 
TRISTIUM LIBER

nec me Roma suis debet conferre poetis:
inter Sauromatas ingensos eram.

Nor ought Rome place me among her poets:
I was a genius among the Sauromatae.

—Tristia V.1.73-4

I. Introduction

After the successful negotiation of the marriage of King Zygmunt I of Poland to Bona Sforza, daughter of the Duke of Milan, in 1517, an interesting poetic exchange took place. The Milanese delegation was lead by the Neapolitan humanist Cristoforo Colonna,²⁴¹ who was a chief minister of the bride’s mother, Isabella of Naples. Renowned as he was for his production of poems both in Latin and in the vernacular, the aged diplomat naturally brought along some new compositions to share with the court in Warsaw when he was presented to the king.²⁴² The events of his reception at court are recounted in a poem addressed to Colonna by King Zygmunt’s secretary, Andrzej Krzycki:²⁴³

²⁴¹ Also known as Chrysostomus Columnius or Chrysostomus Neapolitanus (b. 1460 in Caggiano, d. 1528 in Naples).
²⁴² The two poems written by Colonna are entitled Chrysostomi Columnii Neapolitani de simulacro dominae Reginae (an example of a type of poetry that was quite popular at the time, which
Response of Andrzej Krzycki on account of his verses

We saw, my pleasing Chrysostomus, your king,
whom you claim is the reward for such a long journey.
We saw him, and your mind froze, dazed upon the threshold,
as the uncommon decorum held your eloquent requests at bay.
Suddenly, the bishop was there, and grasped you by the hand
and spoke gentle words about you in his ear.
And then the king, setting aside his awe-inspiring grandeur,
lent a benevolent ear to your verses.
He empathized with you for your long travels and harsh labor,

Presented a poetic portrait of the prospective bride, Bona) and Ad Sigismundum Poloniae Regem
invictissimum (which is an account of Colonna’s long-suffering travel to reach Poland and lodges
his opinion that the sight of the king is well worth the reward). The whole poetic exchange is
contained in an Ossolineum print (No. 20347) entitled Epithalamion cum aliis lectu non iniucundis
(Kraków: J. Haller, 1518). This is one of two printings of Krzycki’s Epithalamion done by the same
printer in the same year (the other is entitled simply Epithalamium Divi Sigismundi primi inclytae
regis et Bona, reginae Poloniae); the 20347 print (cum aliis lectu”) contains the poems concerned here,
while the other version contains only the epithalamion. These poems have been reproduced in
their entirety in Bronislaw Nadolski, “Z Teki Humanistycznej: Poetycka wymiana myśli A.
Krzyckiego z Neapolitańczykiem Columniumsem,” Pamiętnik Literacki (1934), which is my source
for the text. The English translations are my own.

243 He was known in humanist circles as Andreas Cricius.
but he smiled at your praise, and said: “He will be ours!”

Go now, and sigh for Italy, embraced by that man
who is greater than anything in the known world.

Apparently the occasion at first had not gone as smoothly as Colonna would have liked, as the unfamiliar customs and strict formality of the official reception had left him unsure as to the opportune time to pipe up and offer up the gifts of his Muse. Krzycki here, however, renders with a courtier’s grace what was undoubtedly an awkward situation: the polished Neapolitan diplomat had to be dragged by the hand in front of the King by Bishop Jan Lubranski, who interceded on his behalf. According to Krzycki’s poem, the king was greatly pleased with the recitation. Krzycki has the king claim Colonna as his own, placing him under his protection, and more importantly, designating him as an honorary Pole: Krzycki cleverly situates the king’s proclamation (noster et inquit erit, v. 10) between his reference to Colonna’s over-land exertions undertaken to reach Warsaw (longaeque viae duroque labori, v. 9) and his exhortation for Colonna to long for his native Italy (suspira Italian, v. 11), which nicely emphasizes his transplantation to his new honorary patria while at the same time mirroring the topoi of the two compositions which Colonna had presented to the king.244

244 The difficulties of his travels were covered in Ad Sigismundum Poloniae Regem invictissimum (see n. 242), while the exhortation ‘suspira’ holds reminiscences of the opening line of the De simulacro dominae Reginae, which begins ‘Quid mirare inhians pictae simulacra puellae’ – the emphasis here, of course, is not on desire for Italy itself, but the girl who awaits the king back in Italy.
Like any self-respecting humanist poet of his day, Colonna crafted a reply to Krzycki in verse, and its contents show a particular sensitivity to his newly-found status as an honorary Pole. He selected as his topic one of Polish humanism’s favorite old stories. Colonna writes that when he came to visit Vilnius (the modern day capital of Lithuania, which was at the time part of the Polish commonwealth) he espied the “Muses of Ausonia” singing in its fields, whereupon they informed the itinerant Italian that they had fled from Rome as the companions of the exiled Ovid (whom the Polish believed to have lived in lands encompassed by their dominion):

Ausoniae Vilnam in campis cantare Camenas
Dum stupeo, in Scythiam sors rogo quae tulerit.

"Exilii comites fuimus - dixere - poetae,
Quem Sulmo in Getico flet periisse solo.
Squallentes misero in luctu transagimus aevum,
Ex quo illum nobis abstulit atra dies".

Rursus, quae positi luctus sit causa requiro,
Illae haec iucundo verba tulere sono:

"Laetandes245 Criciam sequimur, Nasonis in illo,
Quippe vigere animam cernimus et numeros".246

When I saw the Italian Muses singing in the fields of Vilnius, I was dumbstruck; I asked them what fate had borne them to Scythia.

“We were companions of an exile poet, they say, whose death on Getic soil Sulmona mourns.

Neglected, we have lived out the ages in miserable sadness

245 Sic.
246 I have emended the text provided by Nadolski in this one case: in this line Nadolski’s text has ‘aiaam’ where I print ‘animam’, which was likely the result of not expanding the common abbreviation ‘aiam’.
ever since that black day stole him from us.”
Again I inquire why their grief is now set aside;
They issue this reply in pleasing strain:
“Rejoicing we attend Krzycki, for in him, you see,
we find the spirit and verse of Naso flourishing. “

I present this anecdote because it demonstrates that Ovid held a special
importance to the humanists of Renaissance Poland during a period in which it
was common to seek out famous (and not-so-famous) Romans as political and
cultural antecedents; indeed, it was seemingly practiced with increasing vigor
the farther the particular realm lay from the *caput mundi*.247 For the humanists of
Poland it was Ovid who, in his darkest hour of exile, had shed upon their people
the light of poetry and Latin letters, and through them offered a piece of
civilization and its cultivating influence to a previously barbarous land.

Colonna, through his poem, demonstrates that he is well aware of this tradition.

And while Andrzej Krzycki was indeed possessed of a broad Ovidian
streak248—wit, charm, a keen eye for the hypocrisy of the society in which he
lived—it would be his young protégé, Klemens Janicki (Clemens Ianicius), who

---

247 See, for example, the writings of Jan Długosz (incl. *Annales seu cronicae incliti Regni Poloniae*)
where the case is made that the Lithuanian nobility was descended from a cousin of the Emperor
Nero named Paelemon and five-hundred patrician families that fled Rome and settled near the
mouth of the Dubysa. Another local example is provided by one of Janicki’s friends, Augustyn
Rotundus, who in his work on the second redaction of the *Lithuanian Chronicles*, developed the
theory that the Lithuanian dukes were descended from the Roman general Publius Libonus, who
had fled from Julius Caesar, whence he etymologized the Latin name of Lithuania, *Livonia*, from
his *nomen*.

248 This includes the composition of an *Heroides* inspired elegy written in the voice of Barbara
Zapolya, the first wife of King Zygmunt I, addressed to her husband on the occasion of his
victory over the Russians at Orsza.
would come to have the most merit to the title of ‘Poland’s Ovid’—indeed he was hailed as such by poets and scholars of the generations that followed him after his death, including the prolific Szymon Starowolski,249 who first called him ‘Ovidius Polonorum.’ We find in Janicki’s extant poetic corpus no traces of the (in)famous tenorum lusor amorum; he took instead as his inspiration the Ovid who had brought the Muses to the land of his birth: Ovid the Exile. The role of the exilic Ovid as a civilizing influence will come to play a prominent role in the following discussion of Janicki’s reading and adaptation of Ovid’s exilic poetry and persona.

Janicki’s Tristium Liber, a book of ten elegies which were published shortly before the poet’s death in 1542, will serve as the main focus of what follows.250 While the collection takes its title directly from Ovid’s Tristia,251 I have purposely chosen the word ‘inspiration’ to express the relationship between Ovid and Janicki to avoid implying that Janicki is slavishly imitative of his model. One will find no such trait in the poetry of Janicki, whose works are personally inspired, highly original, and represent the zenith of Latin poetry in Poland.252

---

249 (1588-1656). The epithet comes from his life of Janicki in his Scriptorum Polonicorum Hecatontas seu Centum illustrium Poloniae scriptorium elogia et vitae (Venice, 1627).
250 All of the texts of Janicki’s poems produced herein are taken from Jerzy Krókowski, ed. Klemens Janicki. Carmina: dzieła wszystkie (Wroclaw: Zaklad Narodowy im. Ossolinskich, 1966). This edition is accompanied with a Polish verse translation by Edwin Jędrkiewicz, and a commentary, also in Polish, by Jadwiga Mosdorf. All English translations of Janicki are my own.
251 The Tristia of Ovid were often referred to as Tristium Liber throughout the Middle Ages and Renaissance.
252 This is not only the opinion of the present author, but others as well. See, for example, Jadwiga Mosdorf, “O Wpływie Owidiusza na Twórczość Klemensa Janickiego,” Meander (1957),
Janicki, in his production of the *Tristium Liber*, chose to focus on Ovid’s poetry of exile (*Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto*) as a model for a discourse about *amicitia*, which Janicki sought to exploit in order to advocate a particular type of cultivated friendship during a politically turbulent era in the Polish-Lithuanian commonwealth. Furthermore, Janicki viewed the exilic Ovid as a model for establishing an independent poetic voice in the face of authority and a prevailing morality.\(^{253}\) Janicki also employs the Ovidian tactic of establishing an ‘over-reader’ as a vehicle for his message.\(^{254}\) He drafts as his foil his some-time patron Piotr Kmita Sobieński, arguably the most powerful magnate in the Polish realm, with whom he had a turbulent relationship. Janicki takes up the traditional Polish humanistic idea of Ovid as a civilizing force through his gift of the Muses and applies it in an effort to ‘civilize’ his homeland with the pacifying influence of his own Muse in exilic trappings.

---

\(^{253}\) Important for such a view of Ovid is S. G. Nugent, "*Tristia* 2: Ovid and Augustus." In *Between Republic and Empire: Interpretations of Augustus and His Principate*, eds. K. A. Raaflaub and M. Toher (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990), who warns readers of Ovid’s poetry that “the interplay between surface and essence is both richer and more deceptive [than what can be read from external forms]. And so it is with Ovid’s poetry and his politics; it is a foolhardy reader who thinks to discern one readily from the other – yet the effort toward that discernment must be made,” (240). I have adopted such an attitude (re: surface and subtext) towards the Ovidian Janicki, particularly as it relates to his dealing with the authority of his patron in *TL* 3.

Furthermore, though Janicki’s originality has been duly noted and praised, no one has to date elaborated the literary process by which his adaptation of Ovid functions. One way in which Janicki’s poetics display their Ovidian cast is through his penchant for inversion of the commonplaces and rhetoric of Ovid’s exile works: an act which lends them new vitality in their new humanist context and gives his *Tristium Liber* its appeal of freshness and originality. One key instance of this feature which plays an important role in Janicki’s reception of the exile poems is his deconstruction of the zone of rhetorical silence with which the Ovidian narrator surrounds himself. Janicki makes an effort to rehabilitate the efficacy of Ovid’s exilic voice by reintroducing it into a public space in order to employ it in the ethical sphere.255

*Prior studies of Janicki*

The body of prior literature on Janicki, like other work on Polish humanism and neo-Latin letters, is not very large and is made up almost entirely of articles and excerpts in Polish, along with a small number of editions with Polish translation. The first and only dedicated monograph on Janicki was

255 For the sake of clarification, I do not think that the *Tristia* and *Ex Ponto* were ineffective as works of literature or that they represent private communications; the mere fact of the poems’ publications explodes the notions of intimate communication that the epistolary elegies construct as a fiction and makes the poems part of a public communication. I mean that Janicki reads the rhetoric of ineffectiveness and isolation employed by the exilic Ovid and responds, appropriately, in like-fashion (that is, rhetorically) to serve his own purposes through reversal and redeployment of the Ovid’s exilic self-fashioning.
authored by Ludwik Ćwikliński. There exists only one significant piece of scholarship on Janicki in English, and the entirety of his works remains without an English translation. I hope to offer with this study of Janicki in the context of Ovid’s exile poetry something new to the study of his neo-Latin verse, as previous work on Janicki has been focused on providing biographical information about the poet, summations of the content of his poetry, and/or grammatical and stylistic analyses.

The two prior studies that deal with Janicki and Ovid belong largely to this third category. Jadwiga Mosdorf provides a cursory review of the influence of Ovid that can be found across all of Janicki’s work by means of a surface-level examination of the stylistic and thematic tangents that exist between the two poets, resulting in a list of very general conclusions. Several of these are worth recapitulating here: first, while all of Ovid’s poetry exerted an influence on Janicki’s poetic output, it did so in varying degrees, and Janicki continually returns to the *Tristia* and the *Epistulae ex Ponto* in his *Tristium Liber* and *Variae Elegiae*, while references to the exile works are less common in his other poems; second, Janicki took from the erotic elegies of Ovid only what might be deemed

---


257 Here I refer to the single chapter on Janicki in Harold B. Segel, *Renaissance Culture in Poland* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1989). In an effort to remedy the latter problem, I intend to publish my translations of the *Tristium Liber*, *Querimonia Reipublicae*, and *Ad Polonos Proceres*.

258 Here I refer to Mosdorf, “Wpływie Owidiusza.”
as non-erotic or serious; third, Janicki used Ovid as a touchstone throughout his entire poetic career, as reminiscences can be found in his earliest poetry all the way up to his death; fourth, Ovid’s presence in the poetry of Janicki is easy to single out and dissociate from the more general influence of other ancient authors; and finally, despite the strong presence of Ovid’s poetry, Janicki leaves the reader with the impression of a fresh poetic composition, as many of what may be deemed ‘Ovidian traces’ are not apparent on the surface, but may only be detected by more concentrated philological work.\textsuperscript{259}

Ignaczy Lewandowski’s “Clemens Ianicius: Ovidius Polonus”\textsuperscript{260} presents a computer analysis of the texts of both Janicki’s and Ovid’s elegies to produce statistical data which compare various grammatical aspects of Janicki’s poems with Ovid’s under four rubrics.\textsuperscript{261} The results as presented are fairly definitive, as the percentages of the varying categories are almost in every regard within one to two percent of each other, demonstrating that in use of the Latin language, Janicki and Ovid are exceedingly similar.\textsuperscript{262} The argument, however, lacks a

\textsuperscript{259} \textit{Ibid.}, 379.
\textsuperscript{260} Cited above. This article is written in French, which the Latin title does not make apparent.
\textsuperscript{261} These are: \textit{distribution du vocabulaire selon les catégories grammaticales, substantifs selon les déclinaisons, adjectifs selon les degrés du comparaison, et verbes selon les conjugaisons, les modes et les voix} (distribution of vocabulary according to grammatical categories, nouns according to declensions, adjectives according to the degree of comparison, and verbs according to conjugations, moods, and voices).
\textsuperscript{262} Lewandowski’s statistical analysis produces results such as these: “Les différences stylistiques entre la langue d’Ovide et celle de Janicki, en ce qui concerne l’usage des catégories grammaticales, sont minimes.Dans le texte d’Ovide on compte en moyenne seulement 1,6 % de substantifs de plus, mais dans ceux de Janicki on trouve 2.5 % de pronoms de plus. Notre poète utilise 3,45% de verbes en moins et 1,09 % d’adverbes en plus ; en revanche, Ovide exploite les
tertium comparationis, such as an analysis of Janicki’s elegies with those of
Propertius in order to confirm that the similarities recorded by Lewandowski are
indeed specific to Ovid.

It should be clear from these brief summaries that neither of these prior
works seeks to raise important questions concerning Janicki’s use of Ovid as a
literary model, such as why Janicki chose the exilic Ovid as the inspiration for his
Tristium Liber, or how Janicki read Ovid’s exilic persona and reworked it through
his own poetry.263 As the prior chapters on the Renaissance commentaries have
shown, the commentators did not direct their exegetic exertions toward the
explication of literary issues in the exile poetry: it was the poets of this era who
took up Ovid as their inspiration who undertook the literary interpretation of his
works.

Biography and historical context

Two factors necessitate a brief account of Janicki’s life: his lack of
familiarity to this study’s intended audience and the highly personal nature of
the elegies of the Tristium Liber. As with Ovid, the greatest portion of Janicki’s

prépositions plus rarement (- 1,6% ). Il est peut-être intéressant ici d’attirer l’attention sur le fait
que Janicki emploie bien plus de superlatifs qu’Ovide (J. 4.44 ; O. 2,78). Il en résulte que le style
du poète romain est plus vif, et celui de Janicki plus majestueux et pathétique,” (320).

263 Ralph J.Hexter (“Ovid and the Medieval Exilic Imaginary,” in Writing Exile ed. Jan Felix
Gaertner (Leiden-Boston-Köln: Brill, 2007), 216) is inspirational here: “If only we could ask
medieval [or in our case, Renaissance] writers what contributed to the deep affinity they often
expressed and certainly seemed to feel for the exiled Ovid! Lacking their answer, any explanation
which one can offer is of necessity speculative, which is, I would argue, only right and fitting,
since it is, after all, an imaginary realm...I seek to explore.”
biographical information is drawn from his poetry, specifically from elegy VII of
Tristium Liber, entitled De se ipso ad posteritatem (“About the poet himself, to
posterity”), which is modeled very closely on Tristia 4.10. With Janicki,
however, we can corroborate the veracity of his biography through
contemporary vitae and documentary evidence, such as letters, to arrive at the
conclusion that the general framework of his life that he presents is more than
likely true. Janicki was born in 1516 in the village of Januszkowo, whence he
takes his name, near the city of Żnin to a father who made his living as a
farmer. For reasons unknown, Janicki’s father eagerly strove to obtain a proper
education for young Klemens. He was so eager, in fact, that by the time his
son had finished his secondary schooling at the recently established Lubrański
Academy in Poznań, he was practically bankrupt. Janicki presents himself as
being dedicated to poetic composition from an early age (complete with the
familiar image of receiving his plectrum from the hand of Apollo himself), claims
that he gave his first public recitation at the age of 15, and writes: “I pleased the

264 Mosdorf (“Wpływ Owidiusza,” 382-3) lays out the formal compositional similarities.
265 Tristium Liber VII.15-20. Janicki writes that he was born in November of the year that the king
set aside his year of mourning for his first wife Barbara Zapolya, who died in 1515.
266 Regarding the lack of certainty about Janicki’s surname, see Segel, Renaissance Culture in
Poland, 275n1. For a more detailed argument, see also W. Steffen, “Janicki czy Januszkowski,” in
Munera litteraria: księga ku czci profesora Romana Pollaka, ed. Z. Szweykowski (Poznan: Poznańskie
267 Janicki offers the following: “Truly my father, since he handled me too indulgently, did not
wish for me to live among harsh labor, lest my tender hand should ever be worn by the repulsive
plow, lest the summer heat scorch my soft cheeks with its fire,” (TL VII.23-6; the Latin text is
reproduced in my discussion of TL VII). This should of course be taken with a grain of salt: the
elegiac poet presenting himself as being of a soft composition and ill-disposed toward the
ravages of labor is a familiar trope. This is discussed in detail below.
crowd, not because I merited their pleasure: high hopes for a boy were the cause of their favor.”

When his father’s money eventually ran out, his poetic talent secured him the patronage of one of Lubrański’s close friends, who also happened to be the Archbishop of Gniezno and one of the most powerful statesmen in the commonwealth, the aforementioned Andrzej Krzycki, who invited the then twenty-year-old poet to his court in 1536. Krzycki had surely been familiar with Janicki’s rising poetic star for some time through his close relationship with Lubrański, and the archbishop wasted no time in suggesting a topic for Janicki to take up; it was at Krzycki’s urging that Janicki began the first of his historical poems, the *Vitae Archiepiscoporum Gnesnesium (The Lives of the Archbishops of Gniezno)*, consisting of forty-three short epigrams, which he completed only after his patron’s death.

Janicki’s short time under Krzycki’s wing left a deep impression upon Janicki’s outlook and verse, and the poems which he dedicates to Krzycki seem to contain a genuine admiration of the archbishop, not just as a patron, but also as a poet who sought to use his gift as a civilizing force upon his fellow

---

268 TL VII.53-4: Et placui vulgo, non quod placuisse merebar; / Spes bona de puero causa favoris erat. Cf. Tr. 4.10.57-8.
269 He thereby held the primateship of Poland.
countrymen. In the long elegy that begins his *Variarum Elegiarum Liber* (Book of Various Elegies), which is addressed to Krzycki, he writes:

Non adeo fuit ulla dies mihi clara sub illo
   Tempore, Phrixea quo tepet axis ove,
Atque dies hodierna, dedit quae prima sacratam
   Antistes faciem summe videre tuam,
Prima mihi caput hoc mitra rutilante gravatum
   Inspectare loco de propriore dedit
Sarmaticaque virum mirari in gente supremum,
   Quae viguit lapso tempore quaeque viget.

...  
O igitur bello fortes gaudeite Poloni!
   Surgit ab hoc uno gloria vestra viro.
Hactenus Ausoniae concessimus, hactenus illis,
   Quos medius liquidis, Rhene, refringis aquis.
Tolle, Polone, caput, satis est iacuisse malignis
   Hactenus in tenebris; tolle, Polone, caput!
Bello clarus eras tantum studiumque Gravidi
   Inter vicinos laus tua tota fuit.
Iam nunc pacificis Musarum ex artibus amplum
   Incipis a Cricio nomen habere tuo.
Cuius ab exemplis condiscit multa iuventus,
   Barbariem patrio pellere posse solo.
Nec tantum exemplis; accenditur illa favore
   Et patrocinii sedulitate sui.

There was no day so bright for me in that season, in which the axis warms beneath Phrixus’ ram, as today. It was the first to allow me to look closely upon your blessed face, O protector, the first to present your head, weighed down by your red mitre, to me for inspection from a nearer station, and to permit me to marvel at the greatest man of the Sarmatian people,

---

270 ‘*Ad Andream Cricium, Gnesnensem Archiepiscopum, cum primum illum vidit et est allocutus*’ (1536).
a race which flourished once in ages past, and which flourishes now.

... 
Rejoice, therefore, you Poles, brave in battle!
Your glory arises from this one man.

Thus far we have yielded to Italy, to those men whom
you, O Rhine, have split and separated from us by your flowing waters.

Raise your head, you Pole! It is enough to have lain so long
in harmful ignominy. Pole, raise your head!

You were only famous in war and zeal for Mars:
this was all the praise you had among your neighbors.

Yet now by the peaceful arts of the Muses
you begin to attract a fitting reputation because of your Krzycki.

By his example, the youth learns many things,
and to drive out barbarism from our ancestral soil.

Not only by example does he kindle them, but also by his favor
and his painstaking attention to their patronage.

(Var. El. 1.1-8; 97-110)

Here Janicki credits Krzycki with the inspiration and protection of the generation of poets to which he belongs. The themes which Janicki uses here to praise Krzycki will become important for the discussion of Janicki’s persona in the Tristium Liber: the inspiration to further poetry, the repudiation of warlike behavior, and the expulsion of barbarism. One can easily see here Janicki’s inheritance and adaptation of the praise which Cristoforo Colonna heaped upon Krzycki in his epigram with which I began.

It is after Krzycki’s death that Janicki undertakes work on his own Tristia, and, in a sense, Janicki likely took up the exilic Ovid in an effort to fill a void in
the poetic and political discourse of the time that had been left with the passing of his patron. Use of the word *sarmaticus* (v. 7), even if it is an appropriately poetic synonym for *polonus* and fitting to the meter, still carries with it a weight of ideological baggage that immediately projects the statement that Krzycki is the ‘greatest man in the Sarmatian race’ into a battle of political ideas. In the mid-16th century there were already coming to the fore among the nobles of Poland foundational ideas which would form the core of a cultural and ideological movement called Sarmatism that was rooted in the idea that the modern Poles were the descendents of the ancient Sarmatians, a people who inhabited the lands ranging from the Vistula in the west, the Danube in the south, and the Volga in the east.271 This belief led the nobles to cultivate a lifestyle which promoted martial prowess, especially on horseback, to adopt ‘Eastern’ (in this case Turkish) dress and fashions, and above all to strive for an anti-absolutist political structure which allowed for the independence of the nobility over their monarch. This naturally led to aristocratic competition, as powerful individual nobles vied with each other for individual glory. Glorification of great Polish military victories of the past was an important part of this movement, and it can be seen that this is exactly what Janicki targets in his praise of Krzycki, in an attempt to shift the perceptions of what it is that makes a man great and, above all, useful to his nation. One might say that for a poet to praise those who write

---

and aid in the production of poetry is nothing out of the ordinary, and they would be entirely correct; but to call Krzycki not only a ‘Sarmatian’ but the greatest of all ‘Sarmatians’ is an exercise in redirection and a critique aimed at the prevailing cultural ethos. Furthermore, as we shall see, such genuine praise that aligns the poet’s attitudes so clearly with those of the encomiand is conspicuously absent from Janicki’s verses that praise his later patron, Piotr Kmita.

Both Krzycki and Janicki compose primarily in elegiacs (Janicki exclusively so); both were fond of the popular epigrammatic style; and both share a number of topoi. Both wrote Epithalamia: Krzycki for Zygmunt I’s two marriages, and Janicki for the wedding of Zygmunt’s son Zygmunt Augustus. Both also wrote satirical poems in elegiac verse that were political in nature and characterized as laments of the commonwealth: Krzycki’s Religionis et Reipublicae Querimonia (1522) and Janicki’s poems Querimonia Reipublicae and Ad Polonos Proceres (written 1538). In these satirical elegies one can detect their kindred natures and a congruence of attitude toward the political wrangling of the era that was taking place between the King, his wife, and the nobles of the realm. Both poets stoutly support the royal prerogative, as their wit is directed at the petty squabbling and ‘Eastern’ attitudes of the Polish nobility. They both characterize the nobles as tearing the country to pieces with their inability to interact amicably with each other and the king and behaving, in essence, like
barbarians. Such an outlook in Janicki is integral to understanding the role of his persona in the *Tristium Liber*.

Janicki was not long under Krzycki’s official patronage, however, as, much to his distress, Krzycki died in May of 1537, leaving the young poet again without a protector. Enter Piotr Kmita Sobieński, the voivode of Kraków and Grand Marshall of the Crown of Poland, who was one of the richest and most influential men of his time. He was also a close confidant and co-conspirator of Queen Bona, who had continually sought to exert her influence on the realm since her marriage to the king in 1518. Kmita was a well-known patron of Latin literature and artisans, and he soon brought Janicki under his protection. The relationship between poet and patron would turn out to be less than ideal. Kmita wanted what many patrons of verse throughout history have wanted: panegyrics celebrating himself and his family name. When it became clear that such praise was not forthcoming from Janicki’s Muse, Kmita grew extremely impatient with his client. The falling out between patron and poet gave Janicki the opportunity to make use of Kmita as a foil in the *Tristium Liber*, as the ideal object of both his subversive praise and his ethical instruction.272

---

272 Kmita, despite (or perhaps because of) his high-ranking position and his membership in the inner circle of the royal family, retained his keen sense of political opportunism, as is evidenced by his role in the so-called ‘Chicken War’ (or *Wojna Kokosza*, a pun on the Polish word *rokosz*, ‘rebellion’), an anti-royalist revolt of nobles which took place after a gathering at Lviv in 1537. The ambiguity of his support left much to be desired: he was late to express his support for the royal government, likely because he himself was one of the secret instigators of the rebellion. He courted the popular approval of the disgruntled nobility, while at the same time asserting his
One consequential benefit of Kmita’s patronage was his provision of funds for Janicki to travel to study in Padua. He left Poland for the Veneto in 1538 and began his studies under the tutelage of Lazaro Bonamico da Bassano, who for nearly a decade had been closely involved with the steady stream of students arriving from Poland.\textsuperscript{273} Though Janicki was initially apprehensive about approaching a scholar so imminent, (his trepidations are detailed in \textit{Var. Eleg. 8},) the two developed a close relationship during Janicki’s brief stay in Italy, and Bonamico is named as the addressee of the sixth elegy in the \textit{Tristium Liber}. Janicki’s weak constitution and failing health caused him to fall ill shortly after arriving in Italy, and his condition necessitated his return to Poland. It was Bonamico, however, and not Kmita, who provided the funding for his safe return. Through his influence, Bonamico was also able to arrange for an extrauniversity committee to examine Janicki; they conferred upon him a doctorate of liberal arts and philosophy, and the young poet was crowned by the podestà with the laurel wreath as a sign of his poetic achievement.\textsuperscript{274}

One aspect of Janicki’s life which cannot be ignored, since it is brought into such sharp focus in the poetry of the \textit{Tristium Liber}, is his battle with illness.

\textsuperscript{273} Two hand-written letters addressed by Bonamico to Pietro Bembo recommending Polish pupils are contained in Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, MS Barb. lat. 2158, the first dated 10 December 1529 (ff. 75r-75v) and the second 25 November 1530 (ff. 79r-79v).

\textsuperscript{274} On the events involved, see Ludwik Ćwikliński, \textit{O wawrzninie doktorskim i poetyckim Klemensa Janickiego} (Kraków: Akademja Umijętności, 1919).
and the specter of his ever-encroaching death. While Ovid had exploited death and illness as common metaphors for exile, there is no reason to suspect that Janicki’s illness and symptoms were anything but genuine, as he died at the young age of 27 years, undoubtedly the victim of the hydrops (dropsy of the liver and spleen) which afflicted him. His illness produces an interesting effect on the style of Janicki’s poems in relation to his Ovidian model, namely that Janicki has a tendency to invert Ovidian tropes, and especially enjoys concretizing images which were used only as metaphors in Ovid’s exile works.

It is not without irony that Janicki, the consummate personal, subjective Renaissance elegist, would achieve his greatest lasting fame on account of an historical work, and that he, the flower of Polish Latinity, would come to lend his name to Poland’s national poetry prize largely due to the fact that this historical work was popularized by its translation into the vernacular. His Vitae Regum Polonorum (Lives of the Kings of Poland), a collection of historical eulogies in epigram along the same lines as his earlier Vitae Archiepiscoporum, which covered every Polish ruler from the mythical Lech to the contemporary Zygmunt II Augustus, were not published until twenty years after his premature death. They became exceedingly popular, being reprinted several times in Krakow and
translated throughout the 16th and 17th centuries. Through these he “provided the nascent Polish monarchy with solid ideological iconography.”

The influence of Janicki’s verse can be seen in contemporary and subsequent poets of the 16th and 17th centuries. Among the prominent figures in whose work the traces of Janicki can be found are Georgius Sabinus (1508-1560), son-in-law of Philipp Melanchthon, and his sometime student Jan Kochanowski (1530-1584), who would go on to be regarded as one of the greatest artists of the period and the father of the Polish literary vernacular. A fuller account of Janicki’s Nachleben can be found in the introduction to Krókowski’s edition.

II. Ovid and Janicki: amicitia and ‘cultivation’

1. Ovid

Ovid’s books from exile, because they contain a large number of epistolary elegies sent to named and unnamed addressees back at Rome, are inextricably intertwined with the Roman system of the shared obligations between

---


277 This is in the section entitled “O wplywie Janickiego na poetów XVI i XVII wieku,” (xxxviii-lxi).
individuals, which existed on both a personal and political level. The exilic Ovid’s poetry (and Janicki’s likewise) contains an exploration of the conventions on both of these types of friendly relations. The *Tristia*, in their underscored absence of named addressees “dramatise how exile has jammed the works of *amicitia*, maiming [Ovid’s] capacity to perform *officia* and marring his grateful memories with disfiguring silences.” Ex *Ponto* Books 1-3 have even been referred to as an ‘*Ars Amicitiae*’ — a handbook on the art of friendship meant to supplant the *Ars Amatoria* which, by their offensive content, became the cause of the exilic Ovid’s sufferings. This is not to say that Ovid’s deployment of friendship as a common theme throughout the poetry is meant solely for its glorification and without critique; indeed, his use of the tropes of *amicitia* can often serve as a double-edged sword. Furthermore, one can detect throughout

---


279 Oliensis, “*Return to Sender,*” 178.


281 As Claassen (*ibid.*, 119) points out, this type of critique can best be seen in Ovid’s repeated claim to different addressees that they themselves were the solitary safeguard and source of support for the exile in his troubles. This serves, on account of the claim’s increasingly apparent lack of sincerity as it is repeated to different individuals, to reveal the shallowness of the exilic narrator and put on display the “conventions of friendly address for what they often are:” self-seeking flattery. The specific passages Claassen cites as examples are *Tr*. 5.9.1ff. (to Maximus); *Ex P*. 1.9 (to Celsus); *Ex P*. 1.6.41-2 (to Graecinus); *Ex P*. 4.5.34-5 (to Sextus Pompeius).
a pathos which undercuts the praise of public figures that he addresses, particularly in the poems of *Ex Ponto* 4.

On the whole, the exilic narrator’s subjectivity wins the day in his discourse with his family, friends and patrons. All discussions ultimately circle around the conditions of his social and physical isolation: birthday wishes for his wife turn into a meditation on his own absence and the uncertainties of his condition (*Tr.* 5.5); a celebration of Germanicus’ triumph gives way to a lament of Augustus’ lack of mercy toward him and the poet’s own withering *ingenium* (*Ex P.* 2.1).²⁸² This intensive subjectivity also leads the exilic narrator to reminisce on his friends in terms of his own emotions, concentrating largely on sentiment rather than factual details about their relationship and past interactions. The one-sided nature of the conversation produces what Claassen terms a ‘rhetoric of silence’: the lack of replies to the exilic Ovid’s letters and their lack of effect (demonstrated by the continued need for more poems and the deterioration of the exilic narrator’s psyche).²⁸³ combined with suppression of the names of many of the addresses, convey the pathos of the exile’s position and produce the

---
²⁸² The withering of the exile’s poetic talent is, of course, not actual, and this creates a disconnect between what the poet says and what the poetry shows: he says his skill has diminished, yet his poetry is as eloquent and effective as any of his prior works. The debate that this paradox has spawned has been well summarized in Gareth Williams, "Ovid’s Exilic Poetry: Worlds Apart," in *Brill’s Companion to Ovid*, ed. B. Weiden Boyd (Leiden-Boston-Köln: Brill, 2002), 357-360. For the use of poetic deterioration as a trope see Betty Rose Nagle, *The Poetics of Exile: Program and Polemic in the Tristia and Epistulae ex Ponto of Ovid* (Bruxelles: Latomus, 1982), 109-120); Jo-Marie Claassen, "Meter and Emotion in Ovid’s exilic poetry," *CW* 82 (1989), 362-364; and Williams, *Banished Voices*, 50 ff.
²⁸³ In this regard, see also Gareth Williams on the *Ibis*, in *The Curse of Exile: A study of Ovid’s Ibis* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).
impression of an impending backlash ready to be let loose upon any who dare offer help or utter a word in his direction. In sum, this becomes a “poetic stylisation of an irrecoverable reality” and a “redirection of the poetics of erotic elegy.”

This poetic redirection in the exile works fits the trajectory of Ovid’s earlier elegiac work. There is a general acceptance that via their distortions of traditional elegiac topoi, the Ars Amatoria and Amores deconstruct the elegiac genre. One key part of this process is his inversion of prior elegiac veneration of simplicitas (‘simplicity’) to an adoration of cultus (‘cultivation; refinement’: a paradoxical term, covering artificial cosmetic appearance and natural growth or cultivation—no doubt why Ovid chose it as a focal point). The tactic is evidenced most clearly in Ars 3:

Simplicitas rudis ante fuit; nunc aurea Roma est

... prisca iuvent alios: ego me nunc denique natum
gratulor; haec aetas moribus apta meis.

... sed quia cultus adest, nec nostros mansit in annos
rusticitas, priscis illa superstes avis.

Before there was a crude simplicity: now Rome is golden

285 For example, in Propertius’ encomium of Maecenas (Prop. 3.9) and the Elegiae in Maecenanton 1, which supposedly draws on Maecenas’ own characterization of himself in his own poetry. See Francis Cairns, Sextus Propertius: the Augustan Elegist (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 292-3.
286 This is, of course, a direct response to the tension Propertius creates in his depiction of Rome in 4.1, as discussed in Jeri Blair DeBrohun, Roman Propertius and the Reinvention of Elegy (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2003), 113-17.
... Let antiques delight others: I congratulate myself that I was born now: this age fits my character.
...

[but] because there is culture, and there is not present in our age the lack of sophistication which long outlived our grandfathers.

(Ars Amat. 3.113, 121-2, 126-7)\textsuperscript{287}

Ovid uses \textit{cultus} here in the sense of ‘culture; refinement’, and differentiates it from the concept of a superficial façade or appearance, here represented by Rome’s new clothes, acquired by her increasing wealth. He utters these lines as a warning: one is not to be mistaken for the other.\textsuperscript{288}

What is worth exploring here is how the exile poems represent a continued development in Ovid’s use of \textit{cultus}: this concept is repeatedly and overwhelmingly used in a manner that relates it directly to circles of shared poetic production, friendship, and patronage. Of the twenty-eight usages of the verb \textit{colere}, the noun \textit{cultus}, its adjective \textit{cultus}, -\textit{a}, -\textit{um}, and the related noun \textit{cultor, cultoris} in the Tristia and Ex Ponto, twenty-one of them can be linked to these concepts. Ovid’s use of the term in this limited scope is important for Janicki’s own reading and redeployment of the concept in his \textit{Tristium Liber}, where he links it with his own country’s depiction of the exilic Ovid as a literary antecedent and the idea of poetry as a civilizing influence. The following discussion is an effort to make clear one of the specific ways in which Janicki

\textsuperscript{287} A similar trope may be found in Juvenal 6.
\textsuperscript{288} Ibid., 115.
reads the *Tristia* and *Ex Ponto* as works fundamental to the development and critique of personal and political relationships.

From the beginning of the *Tristia*, the exilic narrator reintroduces ‘cultivation’ as an important concept for reading his new, dislocated poetry. In the third line of the *Tr. 1.1*, he commands his book, “*Vade, sed incultus, qualem decet exulis esse,*” (“Go, but unrefined, as is fitting for an exile.”). This usage of *incultus* functions at various levels of interpretation (metaphor, surrogacy, personification) and straightaway creates a problematic nexus of meaning that requires clarification. Several questions spring to mind: does the newly exiled Ovid mean for us to think he is describing the dress of his personified letter, all in black, as if in mourning,289 marked clearly by the word *habitum* in the line that follows? Or should we rather interpret it in a more metaphorical sense, given what follows, as the poetic self-deprecation that will become characteristic of the exilic persona—namely that the poetry itself is *incultus* because of the author’s condition and his removal from Rome, the locus of *cultus*, as described in *Ars 3*? Or are we to take the representation back a step further, realizing that the book, as the surrogate for its author, is only *incultus* because it must accurately mimic its author? In other words, does the lack of culture really belong more to Ovid than the book? After all, why should the book have to look like an exile, seeing as it is the one who gets to return to Rome? And if we understand *incultus* as

---

289 This is how Merula interprets it in his commentary (f. 2r).
referring by proxy to the exile and not the book, is the narrator referring to his own appearance, or is he using *cultus* in the sense he used it in *Ars 3*? Is the exile himself *incultus* due to his social isolation—his removal from his circle of *cultores*? Bound up in all of this confusion is one of the key paradoxes of the exilic corpus: despite the narrator’s numerous protestations that his life and his poetry are distinct entities, *Tr. 1.1*, and many other poems like it, seems to argue otherwise. This whole issue arises again in *Tr. 3.1* (Ovid’s first-person depiction of his book’s surrogate arrival in the city) where, in an explanation of its own shabby appearance, the book claims, “*erubui domino cultior esse meo,*” (“I blush to be more refined than my master,”) once again pointing to the exile’s lack of cultivation. Here in *Tr. 1.1*, while the personified book clearly links its own lack of *cultus* to its appearance, (its lack of oil and pumice, its tear-streaked lines,) the exile’s is described in terms of his sad condition, his physical isolation, and the loss of his communicative faculties.

Through the last books of the *Tristia* (beginning with the final poem of Book 3) and the *Ex Ponto*, the picture surrounding the concept of ‘cultivation’ is generally less ambiguous. I would like first to examine briefly a statement from *Tr. 2* that will serve as a point of departure:

\[
\textit{si saperem, doctas odissem iure sorores,} \\
\textit{numina cultori perniciosa suo.}
\]
Were I wise, I would have rightly hated the learned sisters, powers ruinous to their own cultivator.

(Tr. 2.1.13-14)

The claim that he is a victim of harmful Muses is a commonplace in the exile poems, but the assertion seems to be more meaningful here: there is a also an open admission to himself that his previous role as a *cultor sororum doctorum* has left something to be desired; some sort of shift in the application of his role as a *cultor* is necessitated by his new conditions. He must become *cultor* of something else, or turn his cultivation down new avenues in order to avoid or alleviate the harm that has previously accrued to him, or give it up entirely. It is apparent that, since the exile continues to ply his Muse despite its perniciousness, the last option is no option at all. Instead, with an increasing focus and concentration, he turns his efforts toward the cultivation of *amicitia*—an act which produces another paradox: the act which caused his ruination, his devotion to the Muses, offers also the key to his salvation, through his use of it to foster beneficial friendships. Despite its past and potential harm, his poetry facilitates the maintenance, construction, and re-construction of the relationships that have the ability to reincorporate him into the social order and alleviate his isolation.290 The

290 In the instance from Book 2 of the *Tristia*—addressed to Augustus—cited above, the redirection of his cultivation towards relationship building leaves him in a double bind: not only is he compelled to compose poetry (a potentially harmful act), but he also must address the earthly agent of its inflicted punishments. There is little wonder that the exile Ovid compared himself with Telephus (see Tr. 2.19-22).
‘zone of silence’ (mentioned above) that greets and surrounds this outreach
underscores a lack of efficacy in exile narrator’s voice.

When the role of cultor returns in the Tristia, it is in the first verse of the
final poem of Book 3, and this time it is not in reference to the poet but to the
unnamed addressee, who is a dear and cherished friend to the exile:

Cultor et antistes doctorum sancte virorum,
quid facis, ingenio semper amice meo?
ecquid, ut incolu mel quondam celebrare solebas,
nunc quoque, ne videar totus abesse, caves?
suscipis exceptis ecquid mea carmina solis
Artibus, artifici quae nocuere suo?
immo ita fac, quaeo, vatum studiose novorum,
quaque potes, retine corpus in urbe meum.

Cultivator and venerable protector of learned men,
what are you doing, you, faithful friend of my genius?
And why, just as you were once wont to publicize me when I was whole,
do you even now have a care lest I seem to be entirely absent?
Why do you take up my songs, excepting alone
my Ars, which harmed its artisan?
I pray do this in addition, you patron of the new poets:
as much as you are able, keep my body in the city.
(Tr. 3.14.1-8)

The verbal and thematic similarities between this passage and the passage from
Tristia 2 are pronounced and produce a close link, demonstrating clearly the shift
in the narrator’s attentions outlined above. Take note that now instead of a cultor
sorum doctorum, there is a cultor virorum doctorum (v. 1); once again there
appears the exilic trope of the harmful Muses (v. 6), and here their injury to him
is no doubt the cause of the poetry he writes. These two elements combined cannot help but recall 2.1.13-14. The addressee is *cultur* in two important respects: not only is he a patron and protector of the poets, but also he is a devoted friend; he has not abandoned Ovid’s poetic body to the wolves. This important internecine relationship between good patronage and good friendship is what draws the attentions of Janicki in his use of the exilic Ovid. On top of this, there are further issues in this excerpt from the *Tristia* that Janicki’s poetry of personal relationships takes up. This friend is faithful to the exile both when whole (*incolumem*, v. 3) and in his present afflicted condition; like a devoted physician, he will be the keeper of the exile’s body,’ keeping it in the public eye (*retine corpus in urbe meum*, v. 6) essentially keeping it from dying (*totus abesse*, v. 4). In his own very real and physical peril, brought on by his painful and deadly disease, Janicki addresses the devoted friends who were the caretakers of his own body during his battle with illness.291

From this point on in Ovid’s exilic corpus, the use of *cultus* and its related terms begins almost exclusively to relate to the cultivation of proper friendship emphasizing shared pursuits (here poetry), and the relationship between poet and patron. Take for example *Tr. 4.4*, likely addressed to Messalinus:

291 *TL* 4 is addressed to Giovanni Baptista Montano, a renowned physician who cared for him while he was ill at Padua; *TL* 6 is to his teacher Lazaro Bonamico who provided for his care while at Padua; *TL* 8 is addressed to Polish physician Jan Antonin. These addressees serve as positive *exempla* in his reconstruction of a proper *amicitia* following its breakdown in *TL* 3, his ‘excuse’ to Piotr Kmita. This subject is addressed in the section that follows.
nam tuus est primis cultus mihi semper ab annis —
hoc certe noli dissimulare — pater,
ingeniunque meum (potes hoc meminisse) probabat
plus etiam quam me iudice dignus eram;
deqe meis illo referebat versibus ore,
in quo pars magnae nobilitatis erat.

For I cultivated your father from my early years —
at least have no wish to hide this —
and of my genius (you can recall this) he approved
more than, in my opinion, I was worthy;
he touted my verses with that famous mouth
upon which rested a part of his great nobility.
(Tr. 4.4.27-32)

The poet recalls his past role as a cultor, but now with an emphasis on his close
relationship with Messalinus’ father, Messala. The exile makes clear the proper
reciprocal relationship that he believes should exist between the patron and the
poetic devotee: the poet sings his praises (as he does here in v. 32), in return for
positive publicity — a form of currency which will bring the poet further
patronage and facilitate further poetry. He intends that the paternal example will
influence the son, made evident by the not-so-subtle imperative ‘do not hide this’
(noli dissimulare, v.28).

292 The best source for the ‘rules’ of proper relations between poets and patrons in the Augustan
Age is the comprehensive study of Peter White, Promised Verse, mentioned above in n. 278.
Similar examples to this one can be found elsewhere: see also Ex P. 1.2.129 (to Cotta Maximus):
ille ego sum, qui te colui (“I am he who cultivated your friendship”); Ex P. 1.7.15 (again to
Messalinus): Cetera sit sospes cultorum turba tuorum / in quibus, ut populo, pars ego parua fui, (“May
the remaining mob of your cultivators be safe, among whom I, as if amidst a great host, was but a
small part”); and in the same elegy vv. 55-6: Culta quidem, fateor, citra quam debuit illa est, / sed fuit
in fatis hoc quoque, credo, meis, (“Indeed I confess that your door was paid less court by me than it
was owed, but this too, I think, was in my fate,”); the verses which follow all pertain to
Shared pursuits, specifically shared literary activity, also become important in the exile’s reconfiguration of his relationship to *cultus*. In the exile’s account of his life to posterity in *Tr.* 4.10, he recalls himself among the circle of the famous poets of his age. Propertius was bound to him by *sodalacium* (v. 46, “fellowship”), Ponticus and Bassus were *dulcia convictus membra* (v. 48, “pleasant members of the intimate group”), and Horace-of-the-many-meters kept them together (*tenuit*, v. 49) by means of his *culta lyra* (v. 50, “his cultured lyre”): his poetic faculties, signified by the lyre, are rightly called *culta* in the sense that they facilitate and hold firm the bonds of friendship that exist between the groups diverse membership. Ovid places himself in a line of poetic succession stretching from Gallus, through Tibullus to Propertius. The role of cultivation in such an idealized literary circle is nicely summed up by the verse which follows: *utque ego maiores, sic me coluere minores* (v. 55, “As I cultivated my elders, so the younger ones cultivated me”).

Messalinus’ friendship and his family’s patronage of Ovid. Furthermore, see *Ex P.* 2.2.95-8: *si tamen haec audis et vox mea pervenit istuc, / sit tua mutando gratia blanda loco. / hoc pater ille tuus primo mihi *cultus* ab aeo, / si quid habet sensus umbra diserta, petit,* (“Yet if you hear these things and my voice can cross the distance, let your pleasing charms work for a change in my location. Your famous father whom I cultivated from early age seeks this, if his eloquent shade has any sense”); also several lines of *Ex P.* 2.3 (addressed to Cotta Maximus) including the vocative phrase *culte mihi* (“One who is the object of my cultivation”) at v.3, verses 69-74 (including *vestra domus...mihi...culta,* “your house, cultivated by me,” at vv.73-4) and vv. 79, *nobis...cultus.*

293 v. 41: *temporis illius colui fovique poetas* (“I cultivated and fostered the poets of that age”).
294 Note the diversity of poetic pursuits represented in the passage: Propertius the erotic elegist, Ponticus the epic poet, Bassus, known for his lambics, and Horace, the *numerosus*.
295 He notes in vv. 51-2 *nec avara Tibullo / tempus amicitiae fata dedere meae* (“nor did greedy death grant to Tibullus a period of my friendship”).
296 For a further example, see *Ex P.* 3.4.67-70: *Sunt mihi uobiscum communia sacra, poetae, / in uestro miseris si licet esse choro, / magnaque pars animae mecum uixistis, amici: / hac ego uos absens nunc.*
Examples of something similar can be found in Tr. 5.3. The elegy is crafted as a prayer to Bacchus for aid on one of the god’s festival days. The figure of Bacchus here is, as is his wont, depicted as a savior figure, but it is worth noting that his birth, wanderings, and sufferings allow the exile to see in Bacchus a companion in his affliction, allowing the god to double, to an extent, as the exile’s own poetic genius. As an object of devotion he becomes a representation of the poetic social group of Tr. 4.10 which would enact the rites of his festival day and to which the exile once belonged.\textsuperscript{297} The group is referred to as \textit{cultores hederae} (v. 15, “worshippers/cultivators/growers of ivy”). This phrase may be read as a combination of the varied lexical meanings of \textit{cultus}: it combines the idea of worship and devotion to a divinity with a cultivation of a relationship of mutual benefaction and/or shared poetic interest (the exile was Bacchus’—or the poetic group’s—\textit{cultor}, so he expects that he—or it—will return the favor by feeling his absence and attempting to remedy it);\textsuperscript{298} the agricultural connotation is inescapable due to the mention of vegetation. Janicki will return to such a

\textit{quoque parte colo}. (“we share common rites, poets, if you allow wretches in your troop, and your having lived with me was a great part of my soul, friends: though absent, even now I for my part cultivate you”).\textsuperscript{297} See Tr. 5.3.1-4: \textit{Illa dies haec est, qua te celebrare poetae, / si modo non fallunt tempora, Bacche, solent, / festaque odoratis innectunt tempora sertis, / et dicunt laudes ad tua vina tuas} ("This is the day, if the season does not deceive me, upon which poets are accustomed to celebrate you, Bacchus, and twining their festal brows with fragrant garlands, they speak your praises to your wine").\textsuperscript{298} See Tr. 5.3.33-34: \textit{et potes aspiciens circum tua sacra poetas / 'nescioquis nostri' dicere \textit{cultor abest}} ("You could say, when you look at the poets about your altars, ‘Some devotee/friend/ cultivator of ours is absent").
nexus of meanings in his use of the term in his own ‘autobiographical’ elegy (TL 7).

There is one further aspect of Ovid’s use of the idea of cultivation in the exilic corpus that warrants discussion, since one may detect in it the seeds of a concept that would later come to define literary humanism in the Renaissance: the society of Latin letters formed by the shared study of the liberal arts. It is not my contention that this is its only source—far from it—but I offer it as further evidence that it is quite reasonable that a poet like Janicki would view the exile poems as the model of a type of amicitia that was in his eyes easily adaptable and valid for his own context and relationships. The best example of this particular usage comes from Ex P. 2.5, which is the exile’s attempt at establishing a friendly link between himself and Salanus, companion of Germanicus. The rhetorical basis for the proposed connection rests upon one thing:

Distat opus nostrum, sed fontibus exit ab isdem artis et ingenuae cultor uterque sumus.

Our work differs, but it flows from the self-same font and we are both cultivators of the liberal art.

(Ex P. 2.5.65-66)

Despite the differences between their respective literary outputs, the exile and Salanus are tied together by their status as cultores artis ingenuae, a phrase which can be excerpted wholesale and used later for self-identification as a humanist.
The exile bridges the physical distance between himself and the others whom he seeks to befriend by appealing to shared membership in the cult to which all men of letters belong. This common ground also levels the playing field between princes and paupers. Take for example *Ex P.* 2.9, wherein the exile eulogizes Cotys, King of Thrace, and appeals for his aid with express emphasis upon his cultivation of literature and his membership in the brotherhood of poets:

\[
Adde quod ingenuas didicisse fideliter artes
emollit mores nec sinit esse feros.
\]

\[
... 
Haec quoque res aliquid tecum mihi foederis adfert:
eiusdem sacri cultor uterque sumus.
\]

Moreover, to have faithfully studied the liberal arts humanizes one’s character and does not allow it to be savage.

\[
This matter too provides a certain bond between you and me:
We are both the cultivators of the same rites.
(Ex P. 2.9.47-8; 63-4)
\]

Encapsulated here is the great claim of the humanist educators that we saw in the prefatory letter of Merula’s commentary to the *Tristia*,\textsuperscript{299} and which found its most identifiable advocate in the figure of Desiderius Erasmus: the combination of the *bonae litterae* and individual piety and morality.\textsuperscript{300}

\textsuperscript{299} See above, p. 44.

\textsuperscript{300} Concerning the (proposed lack of) success of the *studia humanitatis* in teaching both good letters and good morals, see Grafton and Jardine, *Humanism* (concerning Erasmus in particular, see pp. 139ff.). Grafton and Jardine see the whole endeavor as an ultimate failure, and argue that the only reason Erasmus is able to be viewed as a success in this regard is the result of Erasmus’ public persona and the survival of his many letters, which allow his personal piety to be read onto an instructional manual of Latin eloquence, like his *De Copia*, and “allow the Erasmus
2. Janicki

Erasmus and the equation of Latin eloquence and sound morals provide a functional segue into the poetry of Janicki and a detailed discussion of his own reception of Ovid’s exilic works. The intellectual landscape not only of Janicki’s Poland, but also of his immediate circle was steeped in the influence of Erasmus. Many Polish artists and scholars were numbered among his correspondents. Among these were not only Janicki’s physician, Jan Antonin, and his patrician friend, Seweryn Boner (who are both addressed by elegies in the Tristium Liber), but also his two most notable patrons, his mentor Andrzej Krzycki (“whose epistolary relationship with Erasmus was one of the warmest among the Dutchman’s many Polish correspondents”) and Piotr Kmita. Krzycki made serious efforts to bring Erasmus to the University of Kraków, though he was ultimately unsuccessful. Though he never managed to see Poland, Erasmus writes in one of his letters:

Genti gratulor, quae quum olim ob barbariem male audierit, nunc et litteris et legibus et moribus et religionem...sic floreat ut cum praecipuis ac laudatissimis nationibus certare possit.

---

scholar to graft piety onto litterae,” despite the lack of any explicit link between humanist educational manuals and “any moral or devotional meta-system,” (139-140).

301 The first lectures on Erasmus took place in Cracow in 1519, given by the English humanist John Coxe, and he swiftly became popular.

302 Segel, Renaissance Culture, 14. Erasmus even claimed that he numbered Krzycki among the most accomplished poets in Europe.

303 Ibid., 12-14.

I congratulate a race which, although it once was poorly regarded for its barbarity, now in letters, laws, character, and religion flourishes to such a degree that it is able to rival the most exalted and praised nations.

Erasmus, in his somewhat backhanded compliment, raises an issue that was partly responsible for Janicki’s choice of the exilic Ovid as a poetic model. Janicki sees the barbarity mentioned by Erasmus as still all too prevalent in the political landscape of the Polish-Lithuanian commonwealth, and latches onto Ovid’s exilic poems, in reading them as a sort of *Ars Amicitiae* and a promotion of the society of letters, as a vehicle for expressing his discontent. He weaves into the exilic model elements of the cultivated friendship portrayed in the epistolary exchanges of Erasmus and his correspondents, producing a union (one might even call it a *reunion*) of the two. Friendship is predicated on all of the above: mutual benefaction, shared literary pursuit, and the conviction that the proper conduct in the study of the *bonae litterae* is the path to an individual morality.³⁰⁵

As Segel writes:

> The immense popularity of Erasmus in Poland obviously cannot be explained just in terms of the Dutchman’s great reputation throughout Europe as a whole. Special circumstances in sixteenth-century Poland paved the way for the warm reception accorded Erasmian ideas. In the struggle to contain the political ascendancy of the nobility, which threatened both the monarchy and the burgher class, Polish reformist politics placed great emphasis on the need to improve public morals and

³⁰⁵ Despite Grafton and Jardine’s claim (in *Humanism*) that the two are not truly linked and that the linkage is merely a rhetorical pose to justify the position of the humanist, they do not deny that the rhetoric was largely pervasive and convincing (in fact, this is largely the problem). Janicki, as a humanist in a circle of Erasmian devotees, could not avoid the allure of this philosophy.
ethics.... In light of this, Erasmian thought, with its strong moral and ethical dimension, would have been irresistible.\footnote{Renaissance Culture, 14.}

Janicki’s poetry is the personal expression of his own Latin eloquence in the ethical and political realms. It is the expression of his exilic Ovidianism—partly in his style and themes, partly in his intense subjectivity and lyricism, partly in the sense that he found parallels between the exile’s condition and his own physical illness and social isolation—combined with his Erasmian education. This leads Janicki to focus intensely on Ovid’s Tristia and Ex Ponto as poetry of interpersonal relationships (to the exclusion of much else). He seeks to lend the Ovidian exilic voice a newfound efficacy by placing its discussion of shared literary pursuits in a new context in which the study of Latin eloquence is equated with moral goodness. Taking into account the attitudes revealed in Cristoforo Colonna’s epigram and its depiction of the exilic Ovid as the one who granted the artes ingenuae (“the liberal arts”) to Poland, as well as the prevalent themes of amicitia and ‘cultivation’ present in the Tristia and Ex Ponto, it is little wonder that Janicki felt compelled to bridge together the exilic corpus and Erasmian ideals as the vehicle for his attempts to show his emergent nation the path toward a more ‘civilized’ alternative to the internecine political squabbles that were threatening to sink Poland’s rising star.
The fact that friendship played an important role in Janicki’s life and was a recurrent theme in his poetry is readily apparent by simply looking at the addressees and content of his poems. Its presence has been previously noted, but has only been examined from a historical perspective so to provide a window into Janicki’s interpersonal relationships with his physicians, teachers, and peers.307 There is at present no detailed discussion concerning the role which the concept of friendship has to play in the young poet’s poetic programme, or how its presence may be linked to his reading of Ovid’s exilic corpus. Its presence as a theme in Janicki’s poems raises the question: what exactly is it doing there and how is it utilized?

2a. Tristium Liber 1 & 2: The establishment of programme and persona

The importance of the theme of friendship in the poetry, as well as the Tristium Liber’s engagement with the exilic Ovid, is apparent from the very first line of the collection.

I liber, I tandem, frustra obluctamur amicis,
In lucem tenebris progrediare tuis.
Servus eris vulgi vili mercabilis aere,
Nil in te patrii iam mihi iuris erit
Et, seu probra tibi lector sive ingeret ignem,
Nequiquam nostram flendo vocabis opem.
Quid trepidas vultusque mihi das signa timoris
Non taciti, in nidum te retrahisque tuum?
Si metuis doctorum oculos, quis iniquior uno

Aut etiam quis te stultior esse potest?
Candida Pieriis sunt pectora semper alumnis,
Qualia Maeonius pectora cycnus habet.
Ignoscunt humana aliis errata, vicissim
Ignosci erratis saepe petuntque suis.

Go, book, go at last; in vain do we resist our friends!
Step forth from your obscurity into the light.
You will be a slave of the mob, bought and sold with base coin,
for you there will now be no paternal duty from me
and if your reader abuses you or consigns you to the flame,
in vain will you call for our help in your weeping.
Why hesitate, and offer me looks and tell-tale signs of fear
that is manifest, and crawl back into your nest?
If you fear the eyes of the learned, who can be more unjust,
or indeed, more of a dunce than you alone?
Ever pure are the hearts of the Muses’ nurslings;
just such a heart the Maeonian swan possessed.
They pardon human errors in others, and in turn
they seek pardon for their own offenses.

(TL 1.1-14)

Both Janicki and Ovid begin their respective exilic works with propemptika, in
which each poet advises and admonishes his book as it ventures out into the
world. As I hope to show, however, the poets’ similar inspirations give way to
divergent aims, as Janicki takes the trappings of Ovidian exile in a direction
which is more fit to their new humanist context. Janicki begins his poem with the
verse I liber, I tandem, frustra obluctamur amicis (“Go my book, go at last, in vain
do we resist our friends”). Janicki characterizes his amici as the agents

308 As an object for comparative reading, the opening to Theocritus Id. 16 may prove helpful.
responsible for the publication of the collection. Without the urgings of his friends, the poetry would never have emerged into the light of day.\(^{309}\) This is a programmatic indication that Janicki is performing a reversal: the exilic Ovid presents his poetic work as his only means of communicating with deserted and deserting \textit{amici} and characterizes himself as the sole participant in a one-sided conversation;\(^ {310}\) Janicki, however, establishes his poetry as the respondent’s side of a dialogue initiated by his circle of learned friends.

Contrast the reluctant pose of Janicki with the eagerness of the exilic Ovid to send forth his book; Ovid even goes so far as to wish that he himself were the book. In this first line the operational silence of Ovid’s exilic corpus is rejected.\(^ {311}\) In essence, Janicki envisions himself as capable of the reincorporation the exilic Ovidian voice—a voice traditionally credited in the literary mythos of Polish humanism with the introduction of literary culture—into society, returning it from its isolation, and reinjecting it into contemporary debate as a voice to be heeded.

Janicki advises his book that despite the dangers that the mob represents, it is the judgment of those who are \textit{docti} (“learned” i.e. “are schooled in the arts”) that really counts, and that their cultural education has made them just, willing

\(^{309}\) This may also be a clever way of incorporating the first poem of the \textit{Ex Ponto} into his first elegy as well, as it may be an inversion of Ovid’s assertion to Brutus at \textit{Ex P.} 1.1.19-20: \textit{nec vos vultis, sed nec prohibere potestis, / Musaeque ad invitos officiosa venit} (“neither do you want this, nor can you prevent it; my dutiful Muse comes to those unwilling”).

\(^{310}\) See Claassen’s ‘rhetoric of silence’ mentioned above.

\(^{311}\) This will also come to play an important role when we come to the discussion of TL 3.
to interact on equal terms, pardoning offenses as they themselves expect to be pardoned (vv. 13-14). It is likely this group of learned readers to which Janicki refers when he invokes the term amici in the first verse. The book, in its fear of them, is characterized not only by its iniquity and foolishness (iniquior, v. 9; stultior, v. 10), but most importantly by its total isolation (uno, v. 9).

Both Janicki and Ovid also devote verses to describing the appearances of their respective books, but in comparison, these descriptions put the two works somewhat at odds. As Ovid sends forth his book, he makes sure to advise it to clothe itself in the dark and obscuring appearance which befits an exile; Janicki, however, commands his book to abandon its cloak of shadows (tenebris progrediare tuis, v. 2) and casts light upon it (in lucem, v. 2). And though Ovid enjoins his book to go unadorned (incultus, v. 3), Janicki’s book is specifically instructed to seek out the palace of Samuel Maciejowski, bishop of Płock, where it will obtain a badge to spruce up its sad raiment and offer it protection from assault on the road.\(^{312}\) This too is a reversal of the Ovidian model which suggests that Janicki intends for his own ‘exilic’ work a more public role: while Ovid’s book, at Tr. 1.1.69 ff., is told that it is justified in its fear of Augustus’ house and is warned against seeking out the halls of the mighty (whence “the lightning from

\(^{312}\) Note also the reversal: Ovid’s book is to shun the halls of the mighty (whence “came the lightning from the citadel upon this head,” Tr. 1.1.72) whereas Janicki’s book is to head straight for it.
the citadel” fell upon Ovid’s head), Janicki’s book is told to head immediately for the
castle (in Janicki’s case, parliament), and then proceed to the palace for the purposes of obtaining protection from harm.

Upon reaching the bishop, the book is to make this request:

Quem geritis, rubrum da mihi ferre bovem.
Qui mihi si splendor desit, contemnar in ista
Veste miser, media proterar inque via.
Namque hodie, quod scis, de solo vulgus amictu
Aestimat et tunicae de bonitate virum.
Vilis homo est, qui non incedens fulgeat auro,
Vilis homo est, quem non serica texta tegant.
Atra lacerna mihi est, facies simul atra, quod unus
Materiae cultus convenit iste meae.
Practer enim morbos, genitus, lamenta, dolores,
Nil cano, nil habeo, tristis et inde vocor.
Ergo rubere tuum nigra de veste iuvencum
Da mihi; conspicuus sic ero, clarus ero.

Sic bene prodibis, tanto sub nomine magnus;
Crede, Polonorum te comitabit amor.

Permit me to bear the red ox that you wear.
If I lack its brilliance, I will be scorned in such a
garment and be trampled in the middle of the road.
For these days, as you know, the mob esteems a man
by his mantle alone and by the goodness of his tunic.
Worthless is the man who does not sparkle with gold as he goes,
worthless he whom silken cloth does not cover.
Black is my cloak, my face, likewise, black, since this
style alone is fit and proper to my contents.
For except sickness, sighs, laments and grief,
I sing nothing, have nothing; I am called ‘The Sad One.’
Therefore your bull to redden my black garment,
permit it to me; thus will I stand out, be distinct.

Thus will you go forth in safety, great under so great a name;
believe that the love of the Poles will accompany you.

(TL 1.54-66, 75-76)
The ‘red ox’ refers to the ancestral arms of the Bishop: these are the arms displayed on the frontispiece of the first print edition of the *Tristium Liber*. If we refer to Ovid’s description of what his book will *not* be wearing, we may see that chief among them are a red title (*minio*, v. 7) and a set of *cornua* (v. 8) by which Ovid means scroll caps or bosses. Janicki cleverly plays on the literal meaning of Ovid’s *cornua* and the color of the bishop’s arms to markedly differentiate the appearance of his own book of poems from that of his predecessor; within the literary fiction of the poem, this difference in appearance reflects again the importance of learned *amici* for the publication of Janicki’s exilic poetry: without the friendship and patronage of the bishop, Janicki’s poems would never have reached the public. His explicit mention of the seal as a badge for his book to wear places a mark of publication upon his book’s exilic cloak—a mark denied by Ovid to his own work. This subtle manipulation also serves as a metafictional device; the reader can see the bishop’s bull emblazoned upon the title page of the book, which paradoxically calls attention to the literary conceit of the *prosopopoeia* employed by both poems, while at the same time lending a heightened reality to Janicki’s work by bringing the poem into the real world through the physical presence of the seal on the book that serves as the poem’s addressee. What’s more, the seal’s physical presence makes apparent that

---

313 See Figure 4.1 below.
the book’s fictional entreaty to the bishop has apparently found success, a fact which lends authority to the narrator’s role as an advisor: his advice worked for the book, therefore let it work for the reader.

Furthermore, Janicki’s advice to his book to seek out the bishop’s seal implicitly carries with it the acquisition of a certain amount of distinction; this fame, in fact, is given as one of the reasons for asking the bishop’s protection (*Da mihi; conspicuus sic ero, clarus ero*, v. 66). The bishop will grant his request for protection, and with it will come, Janicki claims, the love of the Polish people (*Polonorum te comitabit amor*, v. 76). Janicki’s book is to seek out distinction as a means to share literary output with the public, and more importantly, the circle of learned friends who provided the impetus for its production.

Contrast this with the exile’s admonition to his own book in *Tr. 1.1*:

*denique securus famae, liber, ire memento,*
*nec tibi sit lecto displicuisse pudor.*

Then remember, book, to go unconcerned with fame, nor be ashamed to have displeased your reader.

(*Tr. 1.1.49-50*)

Ovid’s book is to forget about fame, make every effort to play the deceiver (*dissimulare, Tr. 1.1.62*), and enter the city like a thief in the night (*clam...intrato, Tr. 1.1.63*). Ovid’s previous fame will only work against his new poetry, and is likely to gain him unwanted recognition (*Tr. 1.1.59-68*). No adoration is likely to accrue to Ovid’s book from its being read.
The above passage from TL 1 (vv. 54-66) contains a critique that makes use of the multivalent concept encapsulated by the Latin term *cultus*. As I have said, over the course of the *Tristia* and *Ex Ponto*, Ovid overwhelmingly employs the verb *colere* and its derivatives in an abstract sense of ‘cultivation’ or ‘culture,’ relating it directly to literary circles of shared poetic production, friendship, and patronage. In doing so, he distances the term from concrete meanings that have to do with physical appearances; roughly 75% of Ovid’s uses of this family of words in the *Tristia* and *Ex Ponto* are employed in this elevated fashion.

Janicki picks up on Ovid’s shift in meaning, following the ancient poet’s more elevated use of the term. Janicki redirects it to critique the contemporary ethos of the quarrelsome Polish nobility wherein value is judged by wealthy
appearances rather than by true culture and literary cultivation. In fact, these nobles are characterized elsewhere in Janicki’s works by their greed and emphasis on fashion.\textsuperscript{314} The passage shows that Janicki has inherited from Ovid a sense of skeptical irony: prevailing sentiment judges a man by the \textit{bonitas} (generally, “good character”) of his clothes—an interesting use of a term loaded with moral connotations applied to a tunic, as though a garment could have ethical value. Note also the moral overtones of the repetition of \textit{vilis} (“cheap,” but also “of base character”). The clothes Janicki’s poetry wears are simple and unadorned because it befits the appearance of grieving, but also because it rejects the common consensus that wealth and its trappings equal moral authority. He seeks only a simple badge for his book to keep the wolves at bay. One can begin to understand vv. 61-2 as a proclamation that Janicki has cloaked his poetry in black, i.e. taken on the exilic persona, not just because the “contents and the appearance match,” but also because \textit{cultus unus}—‘culture/cultivation/friendly dedication/patronage alone’ (in all of the more lofty guises previously discussed in Ovid use of the term) is the overarching theme and touchstone of the work: it is a reflection of what he has chosen to emphasize from his reading of \textit{Tristia} and \textit{Ex Ponto}. It is also worth noting that in TL 1.61-62 Janicki evokes lines from the

\textsuperscript{314} The works to which I refer are his satirical elegies, \textit{Querela Reipublicae} and \textit{Ad Polonos Proceres}.
Tristia (5.1.5-6) with which the exilic Ovid also delineates a poetic programme: lament.\textsuperscript{315}

If Janicki’s attitudes were as yet unclear to his reader, the culmination of the poem makes apparent just what kind of \textit{cultus} Janicki intends to focus on in his little book. In an act of poetic alchemy, Janicki combines the exilic Ovid’s idea of poetic cultivation with the contemporary humanist rhetoric of the liberal arts, in a bit of advice that seems to be less intended for his book than for his envisioned reader:

\begin{quote}
\textit{Sed quacumque feret tua te fortuna, videto,}
\textit{Ne nimium magnus tu videare tibi,}
\textit{Neve supercilium sumas tibi grande; beatus,}
\textit{Metitur proprio qui sua seque pede.}
\end{quote}

But wheresoever your fortune bears you, beware, lest you seem excessively great to yourself, lest you take up a lofty arrogance; blessed be he who measures himself and his goods with his own ‘foot.’

\begin{quote}(\textit{TL} 1.77-80)\end{quote}

The pun is characteristically Ovidian: the play both on ‘measure’ and ‘foot’ is representative of poetic composition.\textsuperscript{316} Janicki here presents the idea that the good life is led by one who may be measured by his own poetic composition, his own Latin eloquence, his own dedication to the \textit{artes ingenuae}. It is by poetic

\textsuperscript{315} \textit{flebilis ut noster status est, ita flebile carmen,/ materiae scripto conveniente sua} ("just as my state is lamentable, so to is my song worthy of tears; the writing fits the subject matter"). These lines outline "Ovid’s project in the exile poetry to restore the generic validity of meter by allowing form and content to convene," (McGowan, \textit{Power and Poetic Redress}, 23).

\textsuperscript{316} The best example of which is in the well-known \textit{recusatio} of \textit{Amores} 1.1.
cultivation and the relationships that come along with it that one is truly healthy, wealthy and wise.

Janicki ends his first elegy by, at long last, invoking the famous exile by name:

Quod si quid lector Nasoni ignoscit, in atro
Tempore quod plectri languidioris erat,
Nec mihi durus erit, qui, dum scribo ista querorque,
Non exsul, sed iam nil nisi funus eram.

And if the reader grants any pardon to Naso, in the dark time of his all-too-sluggish quill, he will not be harsh to me, who, while I write this and lament, was no exile, but already naught but a corpse.

(TL 1.87-90)

This statement, as Mosdorf’s comments make clear, takes the standard recusatio used by the exilic Ovid (i. e. that he cannot produce good poetry because of his condition) to another level: if the harsh conditions justify leniency for Ovid’s professed lack of poetic skill, then more must be owed to Janicki, since, while he is no exile, Janicki is writing the Tristium Liber near the end of his short life, deathly ill with dropsy.317 There seems to be more going on here, however, than a simple play on a common exilic trope. His proclamation, “Non exsul,” calls for

317 Mosdorf, “Commentarz,” 345: “Janicki podkreśla, jego położenie jest znacznie gorsze niż dola Owidiusza na wygnaniu. Jeśli więc złe warunki usprawiedliwiały obniżenie poziomu twórczości Owidiusza, to tym bardziej należy uważać za wytłumaczonego Janickiego, który w chwili pisania elegii był prawie trupem (‘Janicki emphasizes that his position is much worse by far than Ovid’s in exile. So if the poor conditions justify the deterioration in the level of Ovid’s work, it should be regarded as more understandable in Janicki’s case, who was almost dead at the time he wrote the elegy’).
our attention: he clarifies that though his poems wear the appearance of the exile, though he has adopted the exilic persona for his narration, he is not, however, writing from the edges of the world in social isolation. He is, in fact, in the heart of the realm, in Kraków, when he writes this piece that serves as the introduction to his collection. Through these two words Janicki makes it clear that while he will be taking up several of the themes and issues of Ovid’s exilic corpus, and undertaking the lament which helped to characterize it (see queror, v. 89), he will not engage in its rhetoric of silence and social isolation. This is the exilic persona in action, rather than frozen temporally in a far-off, icy landscape. To me it is quite meaningful that Janicki would take up the Ovidian exilic persona in this fashion when not truly exiled himself: it shows a reading of the Tristia and Ex Ponto that does not see Ovid’s historical exile as a condicio sine qua aliter for the production of the exilic aesthetic.³¹⁸

Furthermore, a dichotomy is set up between the external and spatial exile of Ovid (he is very clearly transplanted from Rome to Tomis) and that of Janicki, which is characterized as internal and non-spatial. His own exile is in part a result of the illness inside of his body—he cannot, like Ovid, beg a relocation to a milder place, unless that place is the afterlife. Janicki’s characterization of himself in this fashion allows him to become essentially an exile-of-sorts without ever

³¹⁸ This could provide one post-Ovidian answer to the question raised by Jan Felix Gaertner in his introductory essay in Writing Exile: the Discourse of Displacement in Greco-Roman Antiquity and beyond (Leiden-Boston-Köln: Brill, 2007), namely “How exilic is Ovid’s exile poetry?”
having to leave his room. This is not to make the claim that Janicki’s poetry does not change its location, as it is clear that he writes as though some of his poems are composed at Padua, and some at home in Poland. But this movement is also part of the exilic persona in action; Janicki’s narrator is not rooted in one place, forced like Ovid to produce his spatial travel and temporal passage only through the device of recollection. His own condition allows him to bring the exilic condition with him wheresoever he goes: it remains incorporated in the world, rather than locked outside of space and time, as the Ovidian exile is. This, of course, means that his exilic persona is not necessarily predicated upon its existence as a social outcast, and grants to him the role of the exile-not-in-exile, from which privileged position he may put into action the attitudes and critiques of the exilic Ovid against prevailing morality.

A verbal echo heightens the contrast, highlighting the inescapability of Janicki’s condition. In verse 89, *dum scribo ista*, recalls *Tr.* 4.10:

> afuimus solito, dum scribimus ista, dolore,
in mediis nec nos sensimus esse Getis.

I was relieved, while writing this, of my customary grief, and lost the sense that I was surrounded by Getae.

*(Tr. 4.10.69-70)*

To some extent Ovid is allowed to forget his condition, if only momentarily, through his act of writing. Janicki’s combination of writing and lament offers no

319 Whether this is actually the case or not is, I believe, up for debate. See the next section below.
such escapism (*dum scribo ista querorque*, *TL* 1.89): note the similar line position, and the substitution of *querorque* for the ablative of separation *dolore*. When comparing the two, it seems that Janicki is hinting that his own poems are not vehicles for an escape from his own internal anguish with which to while the time away while his body dies; if they are not so, they must then serve some other purpose. And if the two characterizations are set in opposition, it is implied that Janicki, the exile-not-in-exile, then, is all too aware that he is ‘surrounded by Getae’: the Polish nobles who refuse to embrace the cultivated civilization—a civilization that Janicki sees as based on bonds of *amicitia* and Latin letters, brought to Poland by the exiled Ovid—which the poet envisions as the means by which to escape the barbarism of Poland’s past and the threat of internecine strife.\(^{320}\)

The second elegy of the *Tristium Liber* provides a useful *comparandum*. The elegy is itself a combination of Latin eloquence with a demonstration of individual piety: it is crafted by Janicki as a prayer to the Blessed Virgin *in

\(^{320}\) Recall also the previous discussion of the cultural movement known as ‘Sarmatism’ that was growing among the Polish nobles. It was partly characterized by a particular style of dress—wearing a mustache, high boots, plumed hats, and the *kontusz*, a long robe which reached well past the knee—which was imported from the Ottoman east. The Turks and their armies, about whom Janicki writes much in *TL* 8, are explicitly called Getae, and Janicki further claims in this poem that the Sultan himself claims his people are from the lands traditionally known as Getic. This adoption of Eastern custom was mocked as anti-Polish by Janicki in both of his satirical elegies; the Getae alluded to here by the textual reminiscence could therefore incorporate both the Turks and the Polish nobility who threaten to undermine Polish sovereignty (and are complicit in the sack of Buda, which is the nominal topic of *TL* 8) by their Turkish sympathies.
extremis, while he was suffering from a quartan fever in Padua. A well-known feature of Ovid’s exilic work is the exile’s likening himself to the great sufferers of myth such as Philoctetes, Telephus, or Tityus in his own self-mythologizing. In this poem, Janicki likens himself to Prometheus, a metaphorical comparison that becomes quite real for the suffering Janicki, since he is unable to rise from his sick bed, and thereby, like the Titan, is bound in place:

\[
\text{Iamque mihi videor poena par esse Prometheo;}
\]
\[
\text{Affixus Scythicis sic fuit ille iugis.}
\]
\[
\text{Nulla sui fuerat vincto de rupe potestas,}
\]
\[
\text{Me quoque vis morbi non sinit esse meum.}
\]
\[
\text{Illius infelix praecordia vultur edebat,}
\]
\[
\text{Internus lacerat viscera nostra dolor.}
\]

Now my punishment seems to me be equal to that of Prometheus;
Thus he was chained to a Scythian ridge.
Bound to the rock, he had no power over himself,
so too the might of my illness prevents me being myself.
An inauspicious vulture ate his innards,
my gut is torn with an internal pain.

(TL 2.33-8)

This has its closest parallel to Ovid’s likening of himself to Tityus in Ex P. 1.2—a figure whom Janicki might have aptly adopted from Ovid for his comparison, since Janicki’s liver condition could be paralleled with the repeated destruction

---

321 This nicely preserves the topoi of the first two elegies of the Tristia: an exhortation to the poet’s book, followed by a prayer for aid and preservation.
322 On Ovid and self-mythologizing, none is more important than Claassen, Displaced Persons, 68-72; see also Williams, Banished Voices, 193-201.
of Tityus’ liver. Janicki’s choice to invoke the name of Prometheus, however, rather than the Ovidian Tityus may be of some significance to Janicki’s self-representation as an exilic narrator. Prometheus is a perfect fit for the persona that Janicki is creating, since, despite his punishment, he is one of the most important mythological conveyors of civilization, in that he granted, in defiance of Zeus, the gift of fire to mortal men. In the *Prometheus Bound* of Aeschylus, Prometheus’ transgressions against heaven are expanded, as he is said to have also brought other tools of civilization, most importantly writing and agriculture. In the *Metamorphoses*, he is the creator of mankind, who crafts the human race to walk upright and engineers them to gaze upward towards the heavens. One would be hard pressed to find a better mythological parallel for Janicki to draw upon in his development of the exilic persona as a cultivator and civilizing force. This figure encompasses several of the key components that the exilic Ovid’s *cultus* incorporates.

---

323 *Sic inconsumptum Tityi semperque renascens / non perit, ut possit saepe perire, iecur,* (“Thus the liver of Tityus was unconsumed, ever-reborn and unperishing, that it might be able to perish repeatedly,” vv.39-40). Prometheus was sometimes loosely identified with Tityus in cult and myth. E. J. Kenney, “Tityos and the Lover,” PCPS 16 (1970) argues that Lucretius’ depiction of Tityus in *De Rerum Natura* Book 4 presents the giant as the “prototypical anguished lover.” This may be one reason why Ovid was so eager to compare himself with Tityus. Others are the possible etymology of the giant’s name, which may stem from *tisis* (“retribution”), or the fact that he may be seen as the progenitor of the Tityri, a race of fluting satyrs, which may cause him to resemble Marsyas, another who suffered at the hands of his Muses.

324 *Prom.* 252, 445, 480.
325 *Met.* 1.82-88.
2b. Tristium Liber 3-6: *Instruction in friendship; Amicitia and civilization*

*Tristium Liber 3*

The issues of friendship and patronage come to the fore in the third elegy of the *Tristium Liber*. Janicki crafts the poem as a response to his patron Piotr Kmita, in which he ‘excuses’ himself for not having sent any poems back to Kraków; it is apparent from the poem that Janicki’s lack of output has greatly annoyed his powerful benefactor, prompting complaints and accusations of laziness. Documentary evidence shows that Kmita was not the most sensitive and understanding of patrons, and that his criticism of the young poet could be quite harsh, and in the opinion of his friend and teacher Bonamico, unwarranted.326

*TL 3*, which was supposedly written while he was in Padua undertaking his studies, has traditionally been read in a historical/biographical manner as evidence for the beginning of the rift between Janicki and Kmita. While I do not deny that there was a historical falling out between the two parties, and that this poem is an important representation of that fact, it is not necessary that we understand it as a poem written at Padua in the spur of the moment, when news

---

326 Extant is a reply of Bonamico to Kmita concerning his complaints. The following letter is presented in Ludwik Cwikliński, *Ianiciana: przyczynki do biografii i oceny utworów Klemensa Janickiego* (Poznan: Poznańskiego Towarzystwa Przyjaciół Nauk, 1928), 1-3; also in Ludwik Cwikliński, *Clementis Ianicii poetae laureati Carmina* (Kraków: Polonica Acad. Litt., 1930), xxviii: *Si quem locum admonitionibus castigationibusque nostris relinquuet, admonerem castigaremque ex litteris tuis vehementius...sed in eius adolescentia iuvenilem quandam modestiam et prope senilem gravitatem et constantiam esse vides* (“If he left any opportunity for admonition or chastisement, I would admonish and chastise him vigorously with your letters...but you may see in his adolescence a certain youthful modesty and indeed the seriousness and constancy of an older man”).
of Kmita’s criticisms reached him, as has generally been the case. That is to say, the poem, as a work of literature, belongs to no fixed chronology and is therefore not confined to being read as only referring to a single event. The poems, as they were originally published in the 1542 edition, contain no dates of composition. It is also uncertain whether the descriptive titles given to the elegies were added by Janicki himself, or by the printer as an aid to the reader. And strictly speaking, the title given to TL 3 says nothing about it being written while in Padua: it is merely his excuse for his lack of production when he was in Padua. The dating of the poem, which Mosdorf places in December of 1538, is based entirely upon evidence that is internal to the poem (vv. 4 and 25). These references to the passage of time (“You’ve received my poetry only after nine months,” (v.4) and “this year which has just passed,” (v.25)) are scant evidence for assigning the poem a date. It is entirely possible that they were added to the poem, which is written in the pose of responding at the time of Kmita’s criticisms, to lend verisimilitude to the pretense. There is furthermore no evidence to suggest that this poem was sent to Kmita or circulated during that time. Its first documented appearance is in the publication of the book in 1542. It therefore must be considered foremost as a part of the whole, and one which has a role to play in the overall collection.

327 The title is Excusat Petro Cmitae, viro illustri, patrono suo, silentium suum Patavinum et per occasionem in laudes philosophiae excurrit (“He excuses himself to Piotr Kmita, a distinguished man and his patron, his Paduan silence and takes the opportunity to digress in praise of philosophy”).
328 “Commentarz,” 346.
Skepticism concerning the date of the poem is important, as it allows for a broader reading of the poem as part of a conscious poetic programme rather than as the diary of a Polish humanist poet in verse. It is entirely plausible that this elegy was crafted after his return to Poland in 1540, when he had taken up a post as parish priest at Gołaczów and was doing his best to avoid working for Kmita. The poem serves as a negative exemplar, a depiction of how not to conduct a relationship that is supposed to fall within the parameters of *amicitia*, against which the other elegies in the collection may be contrasted. Kmita serves as a foil to Janicki’s exilic persona and thereby looms over the collection as an implied reader or ‘over-reader.’ It is as if Janicki has decided that in order to lay the proper foundations for the civilized *amicitia* that he wishes to put on display, he must first make clear what it is not.

One must also consider the fact that the topic for the poem, response to criticism for not writing, fits well with Janicki’s adoption of the Ovidian exilic persona, as it is similar to a pose used in the *Tristia*. It is almost as though Janicki is taking up the other side of the conversation that was initiated by the exilic

---

329 This has always been one of the pitfalls in the understanding of the subjectivity of Latin elegy in general. If it is to be avoided in the study of Roman elegy, it is worth an effort to be cautious of avoiding it in the study of neo-Latin elegy as well. For a critique of such ‘historicist’ readings, as they pertain to Ovid’s exile poetry, refer to Jo-Marie Claassen, “Ovid’s Poems from Exile. The Creation of a Myth and the Triumph of Poetry,” *Antike Und Abenland* 34 (1988).

330 It has been suggested that his installation as parish priest, which may have been done somewhat on the sly by Gadkowski’s voluntary resignation of the post to him, was meant to establish Janicki in a post wherein he would not have to depend upon Kmita’s patronage for his living. This has been traditionally seen as the ultimate breaking point of their relationship. On this see Ćwikliński, *Klemens Janicki*, 96-97. It is worth noting that the book of poems was not completed and published until two years after their relationship had formally ended in 1540.
Ovid. In both *Tr.* 4.7 and 5.13, it is the exile who is making the accusations at *amici* for not writing to him:

\[
\textit{tempore tam longo cur non tua dextera versus} \\
\textit{quamlibet in paucos officiosa fuit?} \\
\textit{cur tua cessavit pietas, scribentibus illis,} \\
\textit{exiguus nobis cum quibus usus erat?}
\]

For so long a time why has your hand not been dutifully directed at even a few verses? Why has your devotion failed, when those others write to me, with whom I had but little acquaintance?

(Tr. 4.7.3-6)

\[
\textit{quid, mihi cum dederis ingentia pignora, cumque} \\
\textit{per numeros omnes hoc tueare caput,} \\
\textit{quod tua me raro solatur epistula, peccas,} \\
\textit{remque piam praestas, sed mihi verba negas?}
\]

Why, though you have given me great proof, and though you safeguard my life at every opportunity, do you wrong me, in that your letters console me rarely: you are loyal in fact, but do you deny me the words?

(Tr. 5.13.9-12)

In *Tr.* 5.12 as well, Ovid is forced to issue a reply similar to Janicki’s: Ovid must defend himself and his poetry from a friend’s disappointment at the content of his exilic writings, which the friend does not enjoy due to their pervasive sadness.

Let us now take a closer look at the poem itself. Janicki begins by invoking his addressee and laying out the grounds for his reply:
Kmita, pride of your nation, I spy in you either the many
stars of your virtues or your ancestry.

Do you have something to say, after my songs were finally given to you,
sent by me—and with difficulty too—after nine months?

Of course you blame my sluggish will and
perhaps you suppose that the delay is due to an idle spirit.

Gods as my witnesses, there was no free time so long
at all that would suffice for you.

For a song worthy of you there must be time both
ample and free from my internal anguish.

A whirlwind of cares buffets me with its alternating blasts,
like harsh Notus shakes a broken sail upon the sea.

(\textit{TL} 3. 1-12)

Janicki begins with what looks to be the beginning of a eulogy. The solemnity,
however, is swiftly broken at the beginning of the second distich. The tone is
abruptly altered with the impassioned interrogative \textit{ecquid}.\textsuperscript{331} The curtness of

\textsuperscript{331} The shift also causes a bit of a drop in register, as the majority of the uses of \textit{ecquid} in a short interrogative phrases comes from Roman comedy, and primarily from Plautus. A good classical example comes from Cicero \textit{Pro Roscio Amerino} 36, wherein Cicero barks, “\textit{tu, vir optime, ecquid habes quod dicas}?” (“You, noble sir, do you have something you want to say?”)
“is there something you want to say?” v.3) should come as a shock to the reader who expects groveling. Kmita has finally gotten something from his client after nine months of silence, and Janicki characterizes himself as either the recipient of his patron’s criticism or awaiting his coming criticism. The poems hardly got sent at all (vix quoque missa, v. 4), Janicki claims, with the implication that Kmita should be thankful that he received anything. He then proceeds to ironize: first he begins the third distich with scilicet, the adverb that is used “when an assertion that is obviously false is ironically made or accepted,”332 and, as if that were not enough, proceeds to couch matters in hypothetical terms (forte putas, v. 6). Janicki, in his exilic guise, is not going to take the abuse lying down, and is making use of this ironic tone to assert his moral authority over this breaker of the bonds of amicitia who, as we shall see, has succumbed to the perils of livor (“spite, envy”).

Two subtle shifts begin in the fourth distich. The first of these is characteristic of Latin elegy in epistolary form and is quite common in Ovid: the narrator quickly changes his focus from his objective, second person address to Kmita, and begins to filter the content of the elegy through his own subjective lens; the poem is less to or about Kmita than it is about Janicki’s (in his guise as subjective, elegiac, exilic narrator) experience of Kmita, colored by his

---

digressions on his own condition and circumstances. Accompanying this switch in perspective is a shift in the criticism that Janicki attributes to Kmita. In v. 4, the complaint seems to be about a lack of poetic output, whereas from v. 7 on, Janicki’s defense has much more to do with the quality of poetry than its quantity. The sentiments and commonplaces that Janicki employs in these lines, namely that the Muses require certain conditions of inner peace and pleasing surroundings to make good songs, are the same as the excuses the exilic Ovid makes for the ‘poor’ quality of his poetry. Compare, for example, the simile above in vv. 11-12, as well as what follows at TL 3.17-18, Non amat haec curas genialis turba dearum / nec vult sollicitas ante venire fores, (“This band of goddesses neither cares for worries, nor wishes to approach a troubled doorstep”), to Tr. 1.1.39-42, in which the exile offers his book an excuse for the detriments his readers will find:

\[
\begin{align*}
carmina proveniunt animo deducta sereno; \\
nubila sunt subitis tempora nostra malis, \\
carmina secessum scribentis et otia quaeque; \\
me mare, me venti, me fera iactat hiems. \\
\end{align*}
\]

Finely spun verses come from a serene mind; 
my circumstances are clouded with unforeseen evils. 
Verse needs the writer’s seclusion and leisure; 
a harsh winter assails me, with the wind and sea.

(Tr. 1.1.39-42)

Concerning the development of subjectivity in Latin elegy from the Late Republic to the Imperial period, see Paul Allen Miller, Subjecting Verses: Latin Love Elegy and the Emergence of the Real (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004).
Janicki even makes reference to his own circumstances as a ‘winter’ at v. 16, *haec mea laedit hiems,* (“this winter of mine did harm”),334 which completes the parallels: the necessity of a mind at peace, ship travel, the sea, harsh winds, and winter.

Via this shift from complaints about quantity to a defense of quality, we see Janicki choosing to interpret Kmita’s criticism (whether real or hypothetical in his mind; the seed of mistrust toward his patron is there) as criticism about the quality of his poetry. Janicki shows in vv. 5-8 what he believes to be Kmita’s problem with his poetry: it is not about Kmita, as Kmita would like; this is because, as Janicki claims, there is no space of leisure so great that could suffice for him. On the surface this, of course, appears to be a compliment, but when read in the context of a work that has shown that it will have as one of its core themes the discussion of the proper relationship between *amici,* it takes a turn for the troublesome: Kmita, through the distrust and criticism he has leveled at Janicki, has acted against his own interest if what he desires is poetry about himself. This elegy, placed as it is, following his prayer for the Virgin’s intercession in his illness (*TL* 2), easily allows the reader to assume that Janicki’s Muse is troubled by that illness (vv. 39-42 above); upon closer examination,

334 This mention of winter is also read literally and cited as a way to date the poem to the winter after his arrival in Padua in 1538. The parallels I have demonstrated are enough to cast a long shadow of doubt over the use of this expression as factual, temporal evidence, particularly when what is dealt with in the subjective elegy has little to do with fact or time.
however, it is Kmita’s actions that are shown to cause Janicki to have a soul devoid of the requisite peace required to write poetry about his patron’s greatness. The *interni morsus* ("internal bitings/pains," v. 10) which afflict Janicki are not the symptoms of his swelling liver; they are the internal anxieties caused by Kmita’s behavior towards him. Kmita has not fulfilled his end of the bargain that is part of the *amicitia* between patron and poet: he has not provided Janicki with the safety and peace of mind in which he can do right by Kmita on his end of the relationship, and has in fact done the complete opposite: broken the trust. Though he may have provided Janicki the means to study in Padua, Janicki endeavors to show that it was not out of friendship or care for his client that he has granted the young poet with the opportunity, but rather as a sort of *quid pro quo* agreement, i.e. “I give you money to go to Padua, and you give me poems (preferably about how great I am)” — a type of agreement which is contrary to the principles of civilized *amicitia* which Janicki is advocating.335 Such a style of bargaining is characteristic of the Polish magnates, as Janicki presents them in his *Querela Reipublicae* and *Ad Polonos Proceres*.

335 According to White (*Promised Verse*, 3-34) the *quid pro quo* was out of bounds in *amicitia* between patron and poet; there were no occasions upon which payment was made for the presentation of a poem. Gifts to poetic clients were made in such ways that they could not easily be revoked. As we shall see in *TL* 4, it appears as though Kmita did just that, refusing to be the source of funds for Janicki’s return home. This, coupled with the characterization outlined above, is what makes me suspect that *TL* 3 was written after Janicki’s return with an express literary purpose.
Furthermore, Janicki’s assertion that there was no space of leisure big enough to accommodate Kmita in a way that would be sufficiently pleasing to him may also be read as a backhanded compliment when considered in light of Janicki’s advice to his book in *TL* 1. Recall that Janicki admonished his little book in a passage which I cited as being programmatic for Janicki’s adaptation of exilic Ovidian *cultus*: “But whithersoever your fortune bears you, beware, lest you seem excessively great to yourself, lest you take up a lofty arrogance; blessed be he who measures himself and his with his own ‗foot,’ (TL 1.77-80). If a man is to keep himself within the bounds of his own ‗foot,’ in order to be *beatus*, then the fact that Kmita has outgrown a place in Janicki’s poetic *oeuvre* should be somewhat damning, considering the preceding verses concern the need to avoid arrogance. There is clearly no ‗foot’ for a man like Kmita in the circle of friends Janicki cultivates with the *Tristium Liber*.

The fact that the solicitude caused by Kmita’s lack of faith in the poet is the real problem, rather than his physical condition and illness, becomes increasingly apparent as the poem continues.

\[\text{Nunc tua suspicio me torquet et hostis,}^{336} \text{eandem}\\ \text{Qui tibi materia firmat alitque tua.}\\ \text{Nunc animum crucio terrore metuque futuri,}\\ \text{Ut miser exorta navita nube solet.}\]

---

\[^{336}\text{A reference obviously to Stanisław Orzechowski,}^{\text{a}}\text{ the anti-Reformation polemicist who was also under Kmita’s protection, claims Segel (Renaissance Culture, 241); I admit, however, that since there is no citation of where the identification was originally made or by what evidence, I am skeptical of any historical identification. See below for my explanation of the presence of the unidentified enemy in the poem.}\]
*Sic timor ergo diem turbat, mala somnia noctem.*

O soror infernis sollicitudo dei!

*Tu mihi fregisti plectrum, quod amicus Apollo*

*Donarat vitae post tria lustra mihi.*

*Tu mihi sevisti spinas in pectore et illis*

*Aonidum ex illo pulsus abivit amor.*

*Est etiam, est aliud, fateor, cessare quod istud*

*Pierio motum numine fecit opus.*

*Nemo simul coluit magni sacraria Phoebi,*

*Naturae obscuras ediditque vias.*

Now your suspicion distorts me, and an enemy

who proves and feeds it in you with your own fuel.

Now I torture my spirit with fear and dread to come,

like a poor sailor when a dark cloud rises.

Thus angst disturbs my day, nightmares my nights—

O Worry, sister to infernal powers!

You have broken my plectrum which friendly Apollo

granted to me when I was just fifteen.

You have sown briars in my breast, and on their account

love of the Muses has departed, expelled from my heart.

There is another thing, I confess, which makes the

work that you want cease to stir with Pierian power:

no one has simultaneously cultivated the shrines of Phoebus

and learned the hidden pathways of nature.

*(TL 3.27-39)*

Here Janicki gives the game away: his illness is now all but forgotten as the cause

of his poetic impotence. Fear and dread assail our poor poet, caused by his

patron’s suspicion. His mention of an unidentified enemy draws a clear parallel
between Janicki and the exilic Ovid, and casts Kmita in the role of Augustus through the similarity of the situation to the one Ovid depicts at Tr. 2.1.77:337

\[a l \ f e r u s \ e t \ n o b i s \ c r u d e l i o r \ o m n i b u s \ h o s t i s,\]
\[d e l i c i a s \ l e g i t \ q u i \ t i b i \ c u m q u e \ m e a s,\]
\[c a r m i n a \ n e \ n o s t r i s \ q u a e \ t e \ v e n e r a n t i a \ l i b r i\]
\[i u d i c i o \ p o s s i n t \ c a n d i d i o r e \ l e g i.\]

Oh how savage and crueler to me than any man was the enemy who read to you my playful songs, rendering the songs in my books which venerate you incapable of being read with a less biased assessment.\(^3\)38

(Tr. 2.1.77)

Once again Janicki’s allusion to the Ovidian text has to do with a reader’s dissatisfaction with poetic content; here, it explicitly references the perceived lack of sufficient reverence for the addressee. With the parallel drawn between their respective situations, Janicki redirects the Ovidian original. Where Ovid stresses the role of the ‘enemy’ in disturbing the relationship between himself and Augustus, for Janicki the ‘enemy’ is mentioned almost as an afterthought: this unnamed detractor matters not, as he only serves as the external force which allows Kmita to give way to the unfriendly feelings which come from within him (see specifically \textit{tua suspicio}, v. 27, and \textit{materia...tua}, v.28).

---

337 This is not the only place in Janicki’s oeuvre where such a clear parallel is drawn. Epigram 63 is a twelve-verse entreaty of Kmita that is clearly based on a portion of Tr. 2 (the exile’s address to Augustus) as Ćwikliński (\textit{Klemens Janicki}, 174) has argued.

338 On the paranoia assailing the exilic Ovid, and the unnamed enemy as a manifestation of that paranoia, see Williams, \textit{The Curse of Exile}.
A clever bit of sleight-of-addressee makes what could easily be viewed as the most blatant attack on Kmita appear ambiguous. The question arises: who exactly is the addressee of vv. 33-36? The clever placement of the vocative exclamation to Worry before the direct second person address lends the poet the excuse that his harsh criticisms are directed at the troublesome divinity; equally present in the mind of the reader, however, should be that the nominal addressee and intended reader of the poem, made clear from the very first verse, is Kmita. Use of the second person pronoun in non-narrative elegy is a common feature (employed over 500 times in Ovid’s exilic works alone) used for addressing the *interlocutor* or *addressee* of the poem.\(^{339}\) Within horizon of expectations of the genre, it makes sense that the reader expect second-person pronouns to be in reference to the poem’s addressee. Furthermore, in the poem up until this point, all other uses of the second person pronoun in all cases have been in reference to Kmita.

Also telling is the attribution of the adjective *amicus* (”friendly”) to Apollo in the first accusation (vv. 33-4). The second line of this distich is essentially a gloss upon this adjective: Apollo is *amicus* because he has enabled Janicki in his pursuit of poetry and his own cultivation of the *artes ingenuae*, here couched in metaphorical terms as the gift of a plectrum for his lyre (easily translatable also as “pen”). A simple syllogism arises, and by deduction Kmita is left out in the

cold: those who are amicus facilitate ars (as I have also argued in the discussion of
the first verse of the book, above); Kmita is not facilitating, but rather hindering
his art; therefore, Kmita is no amicus.

The last lines of the text excerpted above (TL 3.38-9) present another line
of reasoning that will serve as a segue into Janicki’s laudes Sophiae (“praises of
Wisdom”), whom he personifies in the form of Pallas. His claim in this couplet is
that one cannot write poems when one is engaged in the study of philosophy,
and he cites his example Vergil (ipse Maro, v. 41), only after excusing himself in
typical Ovidian fashion for comparing the great with the miniscule.340 This claim,
while seemingly innocuous, also implicates Kmita to a certain degree in Janicki’s
poetic impotence, and what’s more, does so by damning Kmita for his primary
benevolence toward Janicki. It was Kmita, after all, who provided Janicki the
means to undertake such studies, so he must be considered ultimately
responsible for his lack of poetic output. Or if not responsible, he should at least
be to blame for his complete lack of understanding of the rigors of the cultivation
of the studia humanitatis which his funds have allowed Janicki to undertake. Such
a lack of understanding further serves to cast Kmita in the role of outsider to the
circle of the cultores amici doctique.

340 See, for example, Tr. 1.13.25; 1.6.28; this, of course, was taken up from the first poem of Vergil’s
Eclogues. A nice double allusion arises through Janicki’s use of the expression.
The poetry that follows, written in praise of Wisdom, is partly a eulogy of learning, partly a repudiation of the value of martial prowess. For example, at vv. 71-2, Janicki mentions Ulysses’ vengeance upon the suitors, but only in the context of Pallas’ intervention (hac...dante, “because she granted it,” v. 71); he also recalls the downfall of that greatest of conquerors, Xerxes (Aurorae dominum, v.82) at the hands of Themistocles, who outwitted him. This is hardly disjunctive from what has preceded it: Wisdom and her pursuits are shared in common by Janicki and the amici he envisions in his cultivated circle; Kmita, as Grand Crown Marshall of Poland, belongs to the martial world whose belligerent warrior ethos, which in Janicki’s political poems seems to promote internal strife solely for strife’s sake, threatens to undermine the realm’s stability.

The very fact that Janicki produces a eulogy to someone/thing other than Kmita in a poem addressed to him—a man who was earlier characterized as being upset at the content of Janicki’s poetry—shows that this elegy is more than a simple verse apologia, as it has been traditionally understood. Furthermore, it cautions the reader that the praise of Kmita which ends the poem should be carefully examined.

---

341 This aligns Janicki well with the exilic Ovid, of whom McGowan (Power and Poetic Redress, 6) writes: “The competing forces of history and poetry, of actual military power and imagined poetic capacity, furnish the narrative subtext for Ovid’s representation of his relationship to Augustus, a relationship that dominates both the surface and the essence of the Tristia and Epistulæ ex Ponto.”

342 Take for a single example the first sixteen verses of his Ad Polonos Proceres, which is provided in its entirety in the Appendix.
Si Zephyros nobis promittunt fata benignos,
In laetis doceas scire tenere modum.
Sed, puto, promittunt; neque enim te, Cmita, dedissent,
O lux, o patriae magna columna, mihi. 110
Impediat livor, quantum libet, ut sibi id unum,
Quod pudeat posthac, conciliare queat.
Me tua solatur prudentia, qualis in ullo
Vandalici generis vix fuit ante viro,
Actaque vita mihi sine crimine, quale favorem
Crediderim merito laedere posse tuum. 115
Solatur studium, tibi quod fortasse probabo,
Si dederit reditum sorsque Deusque mihi.
Visnicios absens muros hic metior et qua
Sub caelum possint surgere quaero via. 120
Sunt alti per se, fateor, magnique tuorum,
Audeo nil de te dicere, laude patrum.
Maxima Roma fuit, tamen est dignata poetis
Se dare materiam maxima Roma suis.
Di quoque (cum di sint, nihil sit laudatus illis)
Se praebent sacris et sua templa modis. 125
Et tu me patiere tuis in laudibus olim
Et placida nostrum fronte iuvabis opus.
Utque iuvare queas, o spes mea magna, valeto
Et me, qui de te pendeo totus, ama! 130

If the fates promise me gentle zephyrs,
you could teach me how to keep measure in happy strains,
But, I suppose, they do promise; else they would not have given me you,
Kmita.

My light, great column of his homeland.
Let spite impede however much it wills, so that it may obtain
that sole thing which thereafter causes it shame.343
Your prudence consoles me, such a sort which
scarcely existed in any man of the Vandal race of old,

343 The meaning here is likely ‘success.’ “Let Livor succeed at its impediment, and success is the very thing that shames Livor.”

205
and my life has been led without the sort of fault which,
I would believe, could rightly harm your favor.
Study consoles me, which perchance I will prove to you
should fate and God grant me return.
Though absent, here I pace the walls of Wiznicsza and
and seek a way to make them rise up toward heaven.
They are tall by themselves, and great by your
ancestors’ reputation—I dare say nothing of you.
Rome was greatest, yet she deigned,
great as she was, to give herself as a subject to her poets.
The gods too, (since they are gods, none would be more praised than they),
offer themselves and their temples to sacred measures.
You too will suffer me in your praises at some point,
and you will aid our work with a peaceful mien.
And so you may be able to help, my great hope, may you be well
and to me, utterly dependent on you, be friendly.
(TL 3.107-130)
Segel writes: “At the end of his verse apologia (to call the elegy what it really is)
Ianicius attempts to ingratiate himself anew with his patron by courting Kmita’s vanity.”\[344\] The tone of the praise, however, verges on the overwrought and is
hardly straightforward. I am not the first to doubt its sincerity. Concerning these
lines, Mosdorf reproduces a dedicatory poem (contained in Wroclaw, Biblioteka

---

344 Renaissance Culture, 241. The composition of this poem in the form of an apologia may indeed
add to my argument for the presence of subversive undercurrents rather than subtract: the
disconnect between the surface (“I am guilty because I have been criticized/punished and must
therefore apologize”) and the subtext (“I am unjustly criticized/punished by Kmita”) neatly
mirrors the overall ‘poetics of illusion’ (see Hardie (2002); also see Stahl (2002) and Heckel (2003))
that characterize the whole of Ovid’s exile poetry. As McGowan (2009: 3) writes: “[O]n the
surface Ovid has to admit abject inferiority even as he allows to linger between the lines an image
of Augustus that puts the emperor’s unchecked authority in a dubious light.”
Ossolineum, MS Pawlik. 96) penned by the Ossolineum’s former curator Józef Sygert (d. 1804) for his own patron.345

Jako Janicki niegdys w swoim czasie
Krzyckich i Kmitow łaski zyskal dla się,
Ja z nim podobne mając powołanie
podobnież wszystko w tobiem znalazł, Panie.
Ale Janicki w ozdobnym też rymie
Swych dobroczyńców wiekom podał imię,
Mnie zaś nie dały tego kunsztu nieba,
Ani też tobie moich pochwał trzeba.
On nikłe czucie w szumne zdobił słowa,
U mnie zaś szczerość cała ma wymowa. 10

As Janicki once in his time
earned for himself the favor of Krzyckis and Kmitas,
I too, having a vocation similar to him,
likewise find all things in you, my lord.
But Janicki in too ornate a rhyme
proclaimed the name of his benefactors to the ages;

345 “Commentarz,” 348. Mosdorf shows some development in understanding this passage as potentially undercutting. Elsewhere, Mosdorf (“O Wpływ Owidiusza,” 384-5) reads Janicki’s praise of Kmita as genuine, claiming that he here expresses that his song cannot add to the glory of Kmita, but is gifted to him anyways to display the poet’s good intentions, citing the stylistically similar Tr. 2.67-72 (since both use examples which form a *gradatio a minore ad maius* progression). This reading, of course, assumes that there is no subversion in Tr. 2, a feature whose presence has been increasingly argued for in the decades after Mosdorf wrote her article. See, for example, the dissertation of Bonnie Brier Ford, “Tristia II: Ovid’s Opposition to Augustus,” (PhD diss., Rutgers University, 1977), or for a more general discussion of criticism in the ‘figured speech’ of poetry, see Frederick Ahl, “The Art of Safe Criticism in Greece and Rome.” AJP 105 (1984). For the more recent discussion on this feature in the exile works specifically, see McGowan (Power and Poetic Redress, 4), who sums up neatly: “Herein lies the divided impulse driving the poetic practice of the *Tristia* and *Epistulæ ex Ponto*: the text never says directly what it can imply more safely by suggestion and by the figured language of metaphor and allusion that comes naturally to poetry.” This is a guideline which I think can be profitably applied to a dedicated Ovidian like Janicki as well. Also see the recent commentary on *Tristia* 2 by Ingleheart. On the issues surrounding the terms pro- and anti-Augustan, and their usefulness, Duncan F. Kennedy, "'Augustan' and 'Anti-Augustan': Reflection on Terms of Reference," in *Roman Poetry and Propaganda in the Age of Augustus*, ed. A. Powell (London: Duckworth, 1992) is required reading.
while I have not given you heavenly artistry,\textsuperscript{346}
you do not have a boastful showpiece.

**He dressed up his faint feeling in boisterous words,**
while I speak with total sincerity.

For Sygert, Janicki’s praises are too lavish, offered in a high-flung style which glorifies the poet more than the patron: the noisiness (*szumne*, v.9) of his words belies his insincerity. As McGowan writes, a “latent resistance” lurks “beneath the surface obsequiousness of Ovid’s exilic persona. By adopting an unfailingly acquiescent rhetorical stance...the poet becomes in verse what the emperor has forced him to become in real life.” \textsuperscript{347} The same might be said here of Janicki and his praise of Kmita.

Where Segel sees ingratiation, I see an iteration and summation of the points that the poet has made throughout the entirety of the elegy. Little of what Janicki writes is in direct reference to Kmita: he mentions Kmita’s palace at Wiznicsza, his ancestors, and the potential help that he could offer, while at the same time continuing to exclude actual mention of Kmita himself from the poem. Janicki’s assertion *audeo nil de te dicere* (“I dare to say nothing about you,” v. 122), couched as it is in midst of the praises, produces an ambiguity: is this a simple *recusatio* (i.e. “You are far too great a topic for me to tackle here”) or a subtle

\textsuperscript{346} This phrase may show that Sygert had this particular elegy in mind: his kunsztu nieba “heavenly artistry” is a possible reference to Janicki’s *qua* / *Sub caelum possint surgere quaero via* (vv. 120-121).

\textsuperscript{347} *Power and Poetic Redress*, 28.
declaration of poetic independence (“I am taking the bold step of saying nothing about you”)? Furthermore, the praise that is directly applied to Kmita is undercut, once again, by the hint of irony characteristic to the exilic persona. The first bit of praise, namely that the fates have promised him smooth sailing by giving him Kmita is qualified by the resigned *puto* (“I suppose”). The vocative epithet which follows is a new expression: *columna patriae* is not found in the corpus of ancient Latin, nor is a vocative address to a persona as *columna*. It seems a fitting expression of praise, but one must also consider that *columna* is transferred to things that resemble a pillar, such as its use in Martial and the Priapea as slang for the phallus. Immediately following this is Janicki’s invocation of *livor* (“spite, envy,” v. 11), an immediate reminder of the fact that Kmita has not been favorable to him and the circumstances which necessitated the writing of such an elegy, casting doubt upon the supposition that he will be beneficial in the future. He praises Kmita’s foresight (*prudentia*, vv. 113-114), but his judgment is immediately undercut by Janicki’s assertion of his own blamelessness (vv. 115-116), and suggests that his judgment is skewed if it can

348 See the discussion of *forte putas* (v.6) on p. 190 above. It seems that Janicki has turned the tables on his patron and will be doing the supposing from this point.
349 I have found in my cursory search of later Latin one example where the whole phrase is picked up: it is in a mid-17th century elegy by the mathematician Joannes Megalinus on the death of Nicolai *comes* Zereny, a Hungarian noble killed by the Turks in 1664. Since the topic of Turkish incursions into Hungary was a repeated theme in Janicki’s poems, it is quite possible that, in his search for inspiration, Megalinus appropriated the expression from his work.
find any fault in Janicki’s conduct. That such a thing is possible is inconceivable to the poet (crediderim, v. 116).

The reiteration of main themes—how one is to behave as an amicus, and how Kmita has not done so—is taken up beginning at v. 123. Rome, which was the greatest city on earth, was not so high and mighty as to deny itself to its poets as a subject because of its refusal to be beneficial toward them. The implication here is that Kmita must learn to do the same: he must conduct his amicitia with Janicki in such a way that his behavior itself provides the necessary material for composition. The future verbs in vv. 127-128 almost serve as a hopeful imperative, a vivid prayer that Kmita will understand the poet’s advice, which is distilled into the final couplet: utque iuvare queas...ama! Be my amicus, since only then can you possibly be of help—to me, to your nation.350

Tristium Liber 4

If TL 3 serves as negative exemplar, that is, a depiction of how not to conduct a relationship that is supposed to fall within the parameters of amicitia, then the fourth elegy of the collection begins the rehabilitation of the concept, set in direct contrast to what preceded it. This elegy is addressed to a physician at

350 Note that the construction leaves the object of iuvare unspecified. Janicki creates the conjunction of his own poetic project with the ability to offer help in general, expressing that to participate in his cultivation of a circle bound by his interpretation of amicitia is how one makes one’s self of some use.
Padua, Giovannii Baptista Montano, who treated him, but it begins with a short prayer to Apollo:

Quo me, quo tandem reddes, Thymbraee, saluti
Tempore, tot votis sollicitate meis?
Iam prope complesti obliquis erroribus annum,
Ut iactor variis exagitorque malis,
Nec nostri miserere tamen, mala cum tot et hostis
Vix posset siccis nostra videre genis.
At scis, quod patriam et carissima quaeque reliqui,
Cum mihi ad hanc urbem susciperetur iter,
Ut colerem melius tua sacra tuasque sorores;
In terra Marti cedit Apollo mea.

When, o when at last will you return me, Apollo, to the health so eagerly sought in my prayers?
Now you have completed nearly a year with your slanting orbit, as I am cast about and shaken by various woes.
Yet you do not pity me, though so many evils even my enemy is scarcely able to look upon with dry cheeks.
But you know that I have left my country and all things dear behind when I set foot upon the path to this city so that I might better cultivate your rites and your sisters: in my land Apollo yields to Mars.

(TL 4.1-10)

There is an apparent continuation of the themes which have been emphasized above. In vv. 7-10 the cultivation of the Muses (colerem, v. 8, from the verbal antecedent of cultus) is explicitly linked with the exilic persona (v. 7) and the

351 Though this a standard temporal phrase, in the reading of the elegies presented here, one is tempted to understand a double meaning, making reference to the prior poem, translating obliquis erroribus as ‘devious deceptions.’ Obliquus is used in such a way in both Horace and Vergil.
internal discord of his homeland (v. 10). Janicki enacts a reversal of the Ovidian exile: from the poem it seems that Janicki is more at home in his new locale (where the Muses are cultivated) than he is in his native land; it is as though he is an exile at home in the land of his ‘banishment’ — a logical impossibility. Where the Ovidian exile is driven from his home and becomes subject to an increasingly one-sided conversation, Janicki’s exilic narrator willingly seeks refuge from the strife of his home in his project to re-inject the exilic voice into a dialogue in an attempt to restore the efficacy of the poet. This is a play on the respective geographic trajectories of the two poets: Ovid went from Italy to Sarmatia (as the Poles saw it), while Janicki in his travels to study at Padua reversed the course.

As with TL 3, a brief discussion of dating is necessary. Mosdorf dates the poems to the spring of 1540 by a combination of two pieces of evidence, one internal to the poem, one external. The statement in v. 3 that Janicki has endured “unforeseen worries for nearly a year,” is coupled with a letter from Janicki to the canon S. Kilowski (dated 30 December, 1539). In it he reports that he has been suffering a fever since the summer, and Mosdorf takes this statement as evidence that the fever mentioned in this letter is the same illness Janicki invokes at TL...
4.3 Whether this is the correct dating or not matters little to the literary fiction; what is important is that, in reading the collection as a whole, the temporal expressions used by Janicki serve to join this elegy with the previous one to place them in direct dialogue with each other, and they are also used in a metaphorical sense to further Janicki’s discussion of *amicitia*.

When one compares v. 3 of this elegy (*iam prope complesti obliquis erroribus annum*) with v. 25-6 of *TL* 3 (*in hoc, qui iam prope praeterit, anno / nescio, iucundam quid sit habere diem*), the verbal and conceptual echo creates a temporal link between the two poems. Janicki’s mention of the unnamed enemy (*hostis*, *TL* 4.5), who appeared in the previous poem (at *TL* 3.27), also adds to this effect. It is of no matter if the poems were composed at different times; the fourth elegy is constructed to appear to the reader of the collection as though it is set directly following the third. This is further reinforced by Janicki’s reference to the passage of seasons. It is clear that *TL* 3 is written in the winter of Janicki’s discontent: *solas haec me laedit hiems* (“This winter of mine has harmed only [my Muses],” *TL* 3.16); in *TL* 4, this winter (echoed by Janicki in v. 33 below) gives way to the rebirth of spring, the metaphorical connotations of which bear discussion in relation to the ‘winter’ of the previous poem:

*Cernitis, ut maestae pepulit modo nubila brumae*

*Sol pater, auratae vellere vectus ovis,*

*Reddidit et mundo faciem rebusque nitorem,*

---

353 “Commentarz,” 248.
You see how father sun has just now driven off the clouds of wretched winter, borne upon the fleece of a golden ram, and has uncovered the world’s face, and placed on things a shine which bristling winter recently destroyed.

Every tree you see cloaks itself in leaves and her propitious head the golden goddess crowns with grain.

The air delights with the varied songs of birds, and the bird of Cecrops mourns the murdered Itys.

The shepherd wanders the thickets, driving his goats and notes upon which branch the wary bird weaves her nest.

Chloris plaits crowns of fragrant smelling flowers, reclining softly by a stream of softly babbling water.

Zephyr plays in his wife’s lap with soft breezes, returned to her from the far waters of Hesperia.

Why recall each and every thing? Now all is reborn by Phoebus’ gift, each thing which was conquered by the frost.

354 Aries, the zodiacal sign of spring.
355 The swallow; see Horace, Odes 4.12; Vergil, G. 4.305-7; and Ovid, Met. 6.422-674.
And my stubborn winter will yet yield to me, and once driven off will give at last, I believe, some space to the spring.
Now we are in high hopes, even if upon his threatening scythe violent death reclines outside my door.

( TL 4.17-36 )

Such a change in season can be correlated easily with the Janicki’s change in circumstances: the winter of TL 3 is evocative of his poetic infertility; it is the season in which no amount of cultivation will yield any produce. The spring, however, in its images of rebirth and in its description in the highly figured speech of poetry symbolizes a resurgence of poetic faculty as Janicki constructs a locus amoenus in which his persona may dwell. The mention of Zephyrus in v. 28 immediately calls to mind the statement made by Janicki at TL 3.107-110: “If the fates promise me gentle zephyrs, you could teach me how to keep measure in happy strains; but, I suppose, they do promise, else they would not have given me you, Kmita.” One may recall that in my previous discussion of the tone of this sentiment, I claimed that the interjection of puto, “I suppose,” casts doubt upon its sincerity. Here the poet uses a similar interjection to cap the list of features that make up his new-found spring, which he breaks off with the Ovidian singula quid memorem? (“Why recall each and every thing?”). This time, however, Janicki’s word choice (credo, v. 34) and tone imply a more concrete belief in the truth of his improving situation.

356 cf. Tr. 3.7.43; Am. 1.5.23
Janicki’s second invocation of Apollo, here in his role as the sun (vv. 31-2), completes the metaphor and expressly links the poet’s spring with a poetic rejuvenation: he has reproduced a beautiful spring in verse by employing Phoebus’ gift: his poetry. This is Janicki’s metaphorical assertion that his plectrum, gifted to him by Apollo and broken by Kmita, has been restored to full working order.

At this point in the poem the reader is left wondering what accounts for Janicki’s sudden change in attitude and the sudden improvement in his circumstances. What has facilitated this poetic rejuvenation? After having read TL 3, one might reasonably wonder whether Kmita has come to appreciate the poet’s project and at last fulfilled his proper role as patron. After all, without the print edition’s title of the poem, the reader would still have no idea who its intended recipient really is: all the reader has to go on is the understood singular ‘you’ of the verb *cernitis* (v.1). The possibility of a follow-up poem addressed to Kmita is quickly ruled out, however, when Janicki names his true addressee:

```plaintext
Ut suscepta tibi est nostrae, Montane, salutis
   Cura, feres certam tu mihi solus opem.
Namque potes, vel nemo potest, licet ipse sub auras
   Phoebigena a Stygiis restituatur aquis.
```

357 At TL 3.33 (discussed above) Janicki specifically characterizes his poetry, in the form of the broken plectrum, as a gift from Apollo.

358 This is a patronymic referencing Aesculapius, the mythical physician and divinity of healing. The name is a rare one: it appears only at *Aeneid* 7.773 (and thereby in the comments of both Servius and Valerius Probus) and twice in the *Liber Medicinalis* of Serenus Sammonicus (12.181, 19.360). Vergil is the more likely source, but an edition of *praecepta* of the *Liber Medicinalis* was published in 1494 by Giovanni Sulpizio da Veroli, student of the great Pomponio Leto.
Arte tua quantum valeas, excelsa notarunt
Iudicia et magni constituere viri.

As care for my well-being has been undertaken by you, Montano, you alone will bring me certain help.
For you are able, or no one is, even if to the breezes above Apollo’s son himself should be restored from the Stygian waters.
Lofty judgment and great men have marked down how great your gifts are in your art.

(\textit{TL} 4.37-42)

It becomes suddenly clear why the breezes are now blowing so favorably: a true \textit{amicus} has been presented to Janicki, a man who has earned the poet’s praises not through his birth, martial prowess, or his position of power over the poet, but rather by two key traits: his benefit to the poet (in this case, \textit{salus}) and his dedication to \textit{ars}. This combination works excellently well for Janicki’s purposes, since the two are linked in a symbiosis reminiscent of the \textit{cultus} of the Ovidian exile works: it is Montano’s dedication to and shared practice of his \textit{ars} that allows him to be of benefit to Janicki; it is this combination that makes him \textit{amicus}. This combination is nicely encapsulated also in Janicki’s choice to recall Aesculapius by the patronym \textit{Phoebigena}, the consummate healer born of the consummate poet.

Furthermore, Janicki also continues his rehabilitation of the exilic voice. The circumstances of his own physical infirmity allow him to make concrete what in Ovid’s exilic corpus was only metaphorical; the wounds and illness afflicting Ovid’s body were by and large symbolic of the wounds and illness.
which disturbed his ‘body’ of poetry.\textsuperscript{359} One of the best examples of this is \textit{Tr.} 3.3, in which Ovid addresses his wife in the extremities of his illness. The exile, near death, writes that if only his wife should arrive, he would rise from his bed, filled with a new vigor (\textit{Tr.} 3.3.23-24). Though the obvious sexual innuendo undermines the exile’s pathos, still present is the zone of silence that surrounds the exile: his wife does not hear him; no wife arrives, no vigor is renewed. With his physician as his addresse, Janicki is able to draw this illness metaphor into the real world at the service of his advocacy for cultivated \textit{amicitia}. We see the end result of Janicki’s plea for help: his voice is effective, help arrives in the form of his friend Montano, and vigor is renewed (It is spring again!) both literally to his ailing body and metaphorically to his body of work.

The praises and admonitions which end the elegy only serve to heighten the contrast between Montano and Kmita.

\begin{verbatim}
Illorum precibus Patavinam victus in urbem
Venisti ad medici sacra docenda dei.
Nolebas. Non quod, si te nosti ipse, videres
Esse tuis impar viribus istud onus,
Sed quia cum patris animus tibi vivere amicis
Tranquillosque dies continuare fuit.
Nec dabit hoc locus iste tibi, quia semper honores
Consuevit varius concomitare labor
Invidiaeque furor, quem calcavere ruentem
Semper praeclari, non timuere viri.
Hoc quoque tu facies, tecum gaudebis et ipse,
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{359} For a comprehensive list of the exilic Ovid’s use of wounds and illness as metaphor, see Claassen, \textit{Displaced Persons}, 239n42.
Won over by their prayers, to the city of Padua
you went, to learn the rites of the healing god.
You did not want to. It was not that upon self-examination you saw
that burden to be greater than your strength could bear,
but because you had a mind to live among your native friends
and string together peaceful days.
This place did not grant this to you, since honors are always
accompanied by various labors
and the madness of jealousy, whose onrush
the distinguished man is not afraid to trample down.
Should you do this, too, even you will be happy with yourself,
and spite has in you that thing by which it is tortured.\footnote{Namely, success; \textit{Livor} will find in Montano the very thing by which it is both aroused and beaten back: the successful practice of his art.}
As you know, lightning spares the small, attacks the loftiest;
quite often the bolt falls to no effect upon the lofty peaks,
all in vain; indeed standing unmoved, eternally will remain
the mountain’s crest, so often struck by Jove.
And your name is from ‘mountain’. Take no note of that
which can in no way harm your ardent virtue.
And reward not however many enemies your glory has, but the number
who celebrate you and esteem your name:
that number is the greater, and in it I shall be a single part
for all the days that the fates have granted to my life.

(TL 4.55-76)

Janicki first establishes an affinity between himself and Montano. They are alike
in that they cultivate Apollo’s rites, but from different angles: Montano’s journey
to study at Padua recalls Janicki’s own, mentioned at the beginning of the poem
(vv. 7-9). Montano too is characterized as an exile as well in the practice of his
art: he is removed from the tranquility he wished to enjoy by the burdens of his
role, removed from the friends located in his home city (vv. 57-60). Janicki
responds to this absence by attempting to fill it for Montano with both his
friendship and his poetry; he offers poetic praises in return for Montano’s
beneficial friendship. Both poet and physician are victims of the *furor invidiae*
(“the madness of jealousy”): Janicki’s bout with *livor* is presented in *TL 3* (see v.
111), and Montano’s excellent reputation makes him a target. Janicki, now
speaking from the stance of experience (post *TL 3*), offers a moralization on envy
and spite that, when applied backwards onto the criticisms of Kmita supposed
by Janicki in *TL 3*, appears to be both damning and instructive.361

Rather than reconciling himself to Kmita, and far from writing the poem
of praise for Kmita and his family that *TL 3* implies that Kmita expects, Janicki
crafts in *TL 4* a depiction of a dear friend and fellow cultivator of learned circles,

---

361 The language and sentiment of both the verses concerning *invidia* here (vv. 63-66) and those of
*TL 3* concerning *livor* (vv. 111-112) are exceedingly similar; both contain elaborate periphrases for
the term ‘success’; see n. 360.
appended with an instruction to think nothing of the jealousy of lesser men. In their affinities, Montano can, in a sense, stand in as a mirror for Janicki. Janicki himself has been the target of Jove’s lightning (see *TL* 4.67-70) because he himself stands where the lightning is wont to strike. Kmita is by implication not included in the circle of *praecleri viri* (“imminent men”) to which Janicki ascribes himself and Montano: imminent men *trample down* spite and envy; they do not *foster* it as Kmita has done. Janicki uses the pun on Montano’s name to his advantage, taking the moral ‘high ground’. What’s more, one must reward those people who celebrate your name—as Janicki has literally done via his punning on Montano’s name, continuing the cyclical nature of their beneficial relationship—and not those who are *hostes*. It is little wonder then that Kmita does not receive another poem addressed to him in the *Tristium Liber*, despite the fact that his presence looms large over the whole of the work.

---

362 This produces an equation of Jove and Kmita that dovetails nicely with the concept of Jove as Augustus in the exile poetry, and his role as an implied reader or ‘over-reader’ of the collection. Adding another layer to Janicki’s reception of the Ovidian exile is the similarity of *TL* 4.63ff. to a verse of the ‘Naso’ of the Carolingian Renaissance, Modoin of Autun (though the two selections have sentiments that are somewhat at odds): *livor edax petit alta fremens, consternere temptans / id quod ovans simplex pectore turba colit. / pertulit an nescis quod longos Naso labores? / insons est factus exul ob invidiam* (“Ravenous spite seeks out the heights, roaring, and tries to lay low whatever the simple-minded mob promotes with their applause. Or are you unaware that Naso endured long–lasting labors? Innocent, he was made an exile on account of envy”). Text is from the *PLAC* (1.571, vv.47-50). On Modoin and Ovid see Thomas Ehlen, “Bilder des Exils – das Exil als Bild. Ästhetik und Bewältigung in lyrischen texten,” in *Exil, Fremdheit un Ausgrenzung in Mittelalter und früher Neuzeit*, eds. A. Bührer, S. Limbeck, and P. G. Schmidt (Wurzburg: Ergon, 2000), 166 ff.
Tristium Liber 5

TL 5 is the second poem in the sequence of three elegies addressed to friends at Padua which are well-placed to present a contrast between proper amicitia and the actions of Kmita as they are presented in TL 3. This time the addressee is a fellow Pole, Piotr Myszkowski, a peer of Janicki who was also undertaking studies at university. In the poem, Janicki recounts the difficulties he experienced on his return journey back across the Alps and into Poland, along with his encounters with the locals in Styria. The poem has close verbal and topical contact with Tr. 5.7, in which Ovid describes the Getic peoples. Janicki, while making his return to his native country, undergoes experiences reminiscent of the exilic Ovid. The geographic and spatial trajectory of Ovid’s exilic travelogues is here maintained (as opposed to TL 4)—the poet makes his way from Italy through the wilds and toward the land of the Sauromatae ("Sarmatians"; the Poles)—yet the values of the respective territories are reversed: the poet is not leaving his patria, but returning to it. The poet, newly crowned with his laurels and his doctorate, is placed in the same role as the Ovid we saw in Cristoforo Colonna’s epigram: he too is bringing the Muses to Poland; but this time, it is a homecoming.

364 Myszkowski (c.1510-1591), who greatly outlived his colleague Janicki, would later ascend to the bishoprics of Plock and Cracow, and become both Vice Chancellor and Secretary to the Crown.

365 The most prominent of these themes is the inability of the poems’ respective narrators to speak effectively.
The problems which afflict Janicki’s exilic persona, however, remain: his illness, while its symptoms have somewhat relented, still lingers. His repatriation is not the ultimate alleviation for his afflictions, nor does it cause him to bring his exilic poems to an end: this poem comes only at the half-way point of the collection, affirming to the reader that the exilic persona, as Janicki envisions it, is not solely conditioned upon a spatial separation of the poet from patria, and expressing Janicki’s view that the Ovidian exilic persona still is necessary and can be of use within his homeland. This attitude points, once again, toward Janicki’s efforts at rehabilitating the exilic Ovid’s voice.

Janicki, in fact, ends this poem by placing the Muses and his patria side by side, and establishes the two as the joint beneficiaries of his, and also his friend’s, poetic output. Janicki’s choice of Myszkowski, a fellow poet, continues the trend begun in TL 4 of addressing his elegies to fellow companions in the pursuit of the arts:366

\[
\begin{align*}
&\textit{At tu, cui placidi faverunt omnia divi,} \\
&\textit{In Musis istic vive valeque tuis.} \\
&\textit{Quod non tam, quia multa tibi debemus, amatae} \\
&\quad \textit{Quam patriae causa Pieridumque precor.} \\
&\textit{His summa accedunt per te ornamenta duobus,} \\
&\quad \textit{Sit modo Parca annis non inimica tuis.} \\
\end{align*}
\]

But you, one whom gentle gods have supported in all things, be well and live there among your Muses.

366 Janicki commends himself to Mszykowski as sodalis (“companion”, specifically a fellow member of a particular group or circle) at v. 49.
I pray this not so much because I owe you many things, but for the sake of a beloved country and the Muses. Through you these both achieve their greatest adornments; may Fate not be unfriendly to your years.

(\textit{TL} 5.55-60)

Both the Muses and the poets’ shared homeland are set to profit from Mszykowski’s continued existence, and the prayer (which is more than a simple salutation) suggests that Janicki’s poetry has a role to play in the preservation of his friend. Janicki’s friendly relations with his learned peer not only benefit him personally (see v. 57: Janicki has received many benefits from their interactions), but his own poetry, if efficacious in achieving its desired end (his friend’s well-being), will be of benefit to their homeland as well. Here Janicki puts the \textit{amicitia} depicted in his exilic works at the service of his nation: it is by the example of such amicable interaction, demonstrated by the shared practices of a circle of \textit{amici}, that Poland, famous heretofore only for its martial prowess and only now emerging from its barbarous past, will achieve its \textit{summa ornamenta} (v.59).

\textit{Tristium Liber 6}

\textit{TL} 6 is the culmination of the ideas expressed in the two preceding elegies, and is therefore deserving of more focused attention. It combines the by now familiar themes of friendly and artistic cultivation with a more open expression of political ideology, expanding the interpersonal model of
interaction which he has constructed outward onto a wider political landscape.

The poem is addressed to his teacher, the aptly named Lazaro Bonamico. The poem is crafted as a continuous and sustained eulogy of Bonamico’s friendship, and is nearly as long as the two previous poems combined. It is very similar in length to TL 3, and I am tempted to read it as Janicki’s version of a poem of the type that he characterizes Kmita as expecting in TL 3. Here, however, instead of a eulogy to his mighty patron, Janicki addresses a poem to his dear ‘Mr. Goodfriend.’

*Lazare, conturbor, quoties considero, quantum
Debeat officiis haec mea vita tuis,
Non secus ac alieno aliquis cum mersus in aere est
Et se solvendo non putat esse parem.
Nam mea quae fuerit vesania, posse reponi
Si rear a nobis tot bene facta tibi?
Quae mihi vel tantum numero percurrere maior
Sit labor, hic nostras quam numerare nives,
Cum gravida Boreae flatu de nube solutae
In terram, sparsum vellus ut iret, eunt.
Nam si praeteream prudens, ut plurima (quod sum
Ingressus Clarium te praeeunte nemus
Cognovique viam simul et compendia, per quae
Pieridum ad sacras venimus usque fores,
Montis in aerii summum rigidumque cacumen
Abluto puris fontibus ante pede,
Aspexique novem Phoebi cum fratre puellas
Et data de magno pocula fonte bibi)
Haec ergo ut sileam, quamvis sint magna velintque
In summo nostri carminis esse loco,
Plura nec iis leviora manent noluntque taceri
Et poscunt lucem iure diemque sibi.
Lazaro, I am confounded whenever I consider how much
my life owes to your kindesses,
much like a man who was drowning in debt
and does not think he is square when he has repaid it.
For what madness would have to possess me to think that
it could be possible to repay so many benefactions?
For me to merely run through their number
would be a greater task than to count the snowflakes here,
when, loosed from their weighty cloud by Boreas’ blast, they fall
to earth, scattered like a lamb’s fleece.
For if I should prudently pass over their greater part, (like how I
entered Apollo’s grove at your leading,
and came to know the path and shortcuts by which
we arrived right at the sacred doorstep of the Muses,
and upon the highest ridge of the lofty mount and its rocky peak
our feet were washed in the pure fountains,
and I spied the nine girls with their brother Phoebus
and drank the cup offered to me from the great font,)
even if I should keep these silent, though they are great and seek
to be in the most prominent place in my song,
many things no less serious than these remain and wish to speak
and seek out their rightful place in the light of day.
What am I to do? It is a crime to fight what’s right; but if I should desire
more than I am capable of, what will I be but a fool?
I am overwhelmed by the mob and mass of your services,
and I falter when I move its bulk.
That I exist, that I live, that I see my country and my people
is all due to your aid, after the gods.

(TL 6.1-28)
As opposed to the overwrought, commonplace praises of Kmita in TL 3, this praise is grounded in a laundry list of specific, tangible, and ongoing benefactions. They are couched in the *adynata* ("impossibilities": here their number is compared to Poland’s numerous winter snowflakes) that are characteristic of Ovid’s exile poetry. Janicki’s use of both *praeteritio* and *recusatio* here is worth comparing with his deployment of these literary devices in TL 3. In that elegy, Janicki’s assertions that he would say nothing of Kmita’s greatness were backed up by the contents of the poetry: he did indeed pass over saying anything substantial about Kmita. In TL 6, the *praeteritio* (beginning at v. 5) becomes a rhetorical springboard which begins Janicki’s long eulogy of Bonamico and his services. Where the *recusatio* in TL 3—Janicki’s claims that he had not enough free time to write a poem that would satisfy Kmita—is undercut by irony and implications about Kmita’s arrogance, here Janicki displays no fear concerning the recipient’s reaction. Though he characterizes himself and his Muse as unequal to the task of Bonamico’s praises (vv. 23-24; also later at vv. 77-80, with the expressions *barbara Musa* and *malos versus*), he nevertheless produces an effort to accomplish his task all the same. Where he feared Kmita’s recriminations for unsatisfactory poetry and therefore wrote little to none about him, with Bonamico he knows there will be no such lack of appreciation.

On the *adynata* of exile, see Claassen, *Displaced Persons*, 231ff.
Duties performed as a fellow devotee of Apollo and the Muses figure prominently among the list of Bonamico’s merits that Janicki plans to ‘pass over.’ Like the other characterizations of amicitia Janicki presents in both TL 4 and 5, here too the facilitation of poetic production plays a prominent role. Bonamico is the one who, despite Janicki’s prior schooling as a poet (which he discusses in TL 7), leads Janicki to Helicon (te praeeunte, v. 12) and brings him face to face with the Muses and Apollo, whereupon he washes his ‘foot’ in their fountains, bringing back the pun which first appeared in TL 1 (v. 80). This is a standard scene of poetic initiation, which has been employed by several poets, from Hesiod through Callimachus to Ovid and beyond. Such an initiation is usually described as taking place in the poet’s youth, so it is somewhat strange that Janicki, already a recognized poet in his own land, would depict himself as undergoing such an event in his later life. It is as though through his interaction with Bonamico, his ‘good-friend’, that he has undergone some sort of poetic rebirth or re-initiation, and been made to understand what it means to truly be a cultor Musarum. And again, like the exilic Ovid of Cristoforo Colonna’s epigram, he will bring these Italian Muses to the land of the Sarmatians by way of Bonamico’s material aid.

Janicki’s portrait of Bonamico presents a friend who was available for Janicki in his time of need. The poet writes about his suffering through illness, but Bonamico was present to lessen its effect:
Nuper enim vestra (reminisci est dulce malorum)
Cum variis essem fractus in urbe malis
Meque unum febres et peiro febrirus hydrops
Sub miseram traherent et sacer ignis humum
(Adde omni gravius leto dextram ulcus ad auren,
Ex quo non parvo tempore surdus eram)
Cumque Charon cumba iam me exspectaret in atra
Et ferrugine a po ceret aera manu,
Tu subitam mihi primus opem, Bonamice, tulisti,
Sum raptus manibus de Phlegetonte tuis,
Tu summos aegro medicos, tu cuncta dedisti,
Quorumcumque illud tempus habebat opus.
Qua mihi non tuleris solantia verba gementi
Sedulus, es nullam passus abire diem.

For recently (I sweetly recall these evils)
when I was racked by various maladies in your city—
a fever, and worse than that, dropsy
and the ignis sacer were dragging me, all alone, beneath the sad ground,
(and on top of these, an infection in my right ear, worse than any death,
from which I was rendered deaf for the most part)—
and while Charon was there awaiting me in his black skiff,
asking for my coin with his withered hand,
You, Bonamico, brought sudden aid to me,
by your hands I was plucked from Phlegethon,
You gave the best doctors to a sick man, you gave everything—
whatever the crisis required.
You allowed no day to pass upon which you,
ever attentive, did not offer some consolation as I groaned.

(TL 6.29-42)

---

368 One may compare this statement to Janicki’s attestation at TL 2.43 that all doctors were useless and had given up the fight against his disease. There he had not yet fully established the theme of amicitia; here with his dear teacher by his side, medical attentions serve to help him on his way, which makes one wonder how exactly our exiled Janicki sees himself as being healed. It is possible we have in TL 2 and TL 4 two different depictions of the same bout of illness: a re-writing pre- and post-Kmita.
Here Janicki is once again able to play with the tropes of the exilic Ovid, projecting the real, concrete circumstances of his illness into the realm of Ovidian metaphor. Whereas illness is often used by the exilic Ovid as the external symptom of inner turmoil and psychological damage, the detailed description of Janicki’s specific symptoms give it all the emphasis of a true-to-life diagnosis.\textsuperscript{369} The equation of death and exile is quite common in Ovid, and here Janicki is very nearly dying in truth and can exploit the similarity of his situation to that of Ovid’s own persona. Also, the characterization of aid from family and friends as healing is a common exilic trope, and just like in \textit{TL} 4, the aid comes in the form of actual healing.\textsuperscript{370} Verses 41-42 may also be interacting with Ovid’s characterization of his own isolation in his illness in exile in \textit{Tr}. 3.3: there he complains that he has no friend to console him and with whom to while away the time in order to alleviate his sufferings. Janicki has reversed this isolation and placed Bonamico by his side.

The reason why Bonamico, the cultured man of letters and fellow poet, has usurped the place of Kmita in his poetry comes to light in what follows:

\textsuperscript{369} One of his numerous afflictions was some sort of aural abscess which rendered him nearly deaf (\textit{surdus eram}, v. 34). This may be an interaction with Ovid’s rendering of the letter from a Ciceronian \textit{sermo absentis} into a \textit{sermo surdi mutique} (on which see Claassen, \textit{Displaced Persons}, 231). It is notable that Bonamico’s aid would render the exilic persona able to hear again, suggesting that he returns to Poland from his new initiation into the Italian Muses as ready partner for dialogue, as opposed to the exilic Ovid who remains in his zone of silence.

\textsuperscript{370} Compare this to v. 38 \textit{Tr}. 5.9.19 for but one example: \textit{Seminecem Stygia revocasti solus ab una} ("you alone recalled me, half-dead, from the Stygian waters").
Bonamico has supplanted Kmita’s role in the real world as well, fulfilling responsibilities that Kmita chose to neglect.

When a return journey due to his illness was necessary, Kmita would not (despite his vast wealth) supply Janicki with the funds to make the trip.

---

371 We continue to see the reversal of values with respect to Poland and Italy. His leaving Italy to head homeward is called a *fuga*, one of the terms used for an exile’s journey *away* from his home. In a way Janicki is now fully re-enacting Ovid’s exile.
Bonamico, however, took up the role of benefactor. This draws attention again (as in *TL* 3) to the fact that Kmita is responsible for Janicki’s assumption of the exilic persona; here, he is exile in both the spatial and the social senses because he was stranded from his home and abandoned by one who was bound to him by bonds of patronage and presumed friendship. Bonamico comes to play the role of the friend for whom the exilic Ovid waited in vain: the friend who can send the exile home. This repatriation of the exilic voice is suggestive of the way in which Janicki develops and evolves the Ovidian exile’s condition by pursuing a poetic programme that aims at the restoration of the exile’s efficacy in the social and political realms.

One may note also how Janicki characterizes himself in a way that is highly reminiscent of his personified book of poetry in *TL* 1. Janicki himself must prepare for a journey out into the world, and expresses concerns over his appearance (v. 53-4), much like his book is advised to do in *TL* 1. His mention of his lack of titles (*titulos*, v. 51), by which Janicki means his diploma,\(^{372}\) is a clever reminiscence of the *nec titulus...notetur* (“your title is not written out”) of Ovid at *Tr*. 1.1.7; at the same time, his mention of the weight that emblems hold among the mob immediately calls to mind Janicki’s personified book begging to wear

\(^{372}\) This, as was mentioned in the biographical introduction, was secured largely due to the efforts of Bonamico, who set up his extra-university examination committee and made sure that he was awarded his doctorate. The diploma and the title of *poeta laureatus* were delivered to him by a Paduan legate by the name of Contarini on 22 July 1540. The text of his diploma is reproduced in Krókowski (*Carmina*, 317-321). Ćwikliński (*O wawrzynie doktorskim*) produces a detailed account of the awarding of the degree.
the Bishop’s emblem because the mob judges a traveller by his outward trappings (TL 1.49-62). The section cited from TL 1 begins evocor in vulgus iubeorquexire (“I am called out into the mob and bade to depart”), and establishes a similar situation to the one faced by Janicki in TL 6. Yet again, we find a reversal: instead of the poetry serving as a surrogate for the poet, as we see at the beginning of the Tristia or in TL 1, the poet here becomes the embodiment of the poetry; it is as though Janicki represents a work that has been crafted by Bonamico and is being sent off into the world. He is a product of the Italian Muses, unsure of his reception among the readers of his homeland whom he seeks to delight and instruct—unsure because he will arrive upon a meager horse lacking a caparison and a title, (in other words, still in the trappings of exile,) not astride the decked-out warhorse of a ‘Sarmatian’ cavalier.

Janicki’s characterization of himself as a literary creation of Bonamico continues. The exilic Ovid often calls his works his children: for example, the personified book of Tr. 1.1 is sent to find his ‘brothers’ (fratres, v. 107), and his labelling as parricides the books of the Ars Amatoria on account of the harm they have inflicted upon their ‘father’ (Tr. 1.1.13). Janicki establishes that his connection with Bonamico is even more than familial:

Dicite, quid quaeso, quid me debere fatebor374
Huic, qui tanta mihi praestitit unus, ego?

373 Here he calls them “Oedipuses and Telegonuses.”
374 Tr. 5.9.5: Quid tibi deberem.
Tell me what I seek: what shall I confess I owe
to him alone who supplied me with so much?
What is owed to a father? More than that: my father gave me life,
yet he [Bonamico] fashioned me with proper character.
The one gave life, the other restored it when lost and adorned it:
something of which a father is in no way capable.
The one loves me: I am his blood; but the other loves
a man born in another world, joined by no blood-ties.

(TL 6. 57-64)

The relationship between Janicki and Bonamico is more reminiscent of the
artificial fatherly relationship of an artist to his work, (like the one the exilic Ovid
deployed,) than actual blood relation. In fact, blood relation is explicitly
discounted as the determinant of the type of obligation that Janicki feels toward
Bonamico. The opposition between attulit (“produce,” of his father at v. 59) on
the one hand and formavit (“fashion,” of Bonamico at v. 60) on the other is
indicative of Janicki’s program: Janciki’s model amicitia is a formative
relationship that results in the alteration of the participants for the better,
specifically in respect to their character (see rectis moribus, v. 60). TL 6 shows that

375 see Tr. 5.9.13: Ille dedit vitam; tu quam dedit ille, tueris (“he gave me life; you kept safe what he
gave”). In the Ovidian line, ille is Augustus. Here Janicki follows Plutarch’s Life of Alexander,
putting himself in the place of Alexander, while Bonamico stands in for Aristotle. Philip gave
Alexander life, but Aristotle taught him kalós zēn — to live well.
we ought to understand the exilic Janicki of the *Trismium Liber* as both the product and solicitor of just such an *amicitia*.

The name of Kmita returns in this elegy. It serves both as a marker that this poem is to be contrasted with *TL 3* and a reminder of his presence as an over-reader of the whole collection. This mention, though, only notes his conspicuous absence:

\[i a m \ t a m e n \ i n v i t o s \ e t i a m \ c o h i b e b o \ p r e m a m q u e,
De \ C m i t a \ a d d i d e r o \ s i \ d u o \ v e r b a \ m e o.
Quod \ t i b i \ n i l \ s c r i b i t, n i l \ m i t t i t, e o \ f i t, a b \ i s t a,
In \ q u a \ s c r i b e b a m, q u o d \ p r o c u l \ u r b e \ f u i t.
\]
\[I m p l i c i t u m \ m a g n i s \ t e n e t \ i l l u m \ R u s s i a \ r e b u s,\]
\[A \ s u b i t i s \ n u m q u a m \ R u s s i a \ t u t a \ G e t i s.
M o e n i a \ n o s \ C r a c i \ c o l i m u s, c u r a m u s \ e t \ a e g r u m
C o r p u s, a d h u c \ i l l a \ q u o d \ m i h i \ t u r g e t \ a q u a.\]

Nevertheless I will even now compell and press the unwilling, if I will have added a couple of words about my Kmita. He writes nothing for you, sends nothing; this is because he is far off from the city in which I was writing. Russia holds him bound with great matters, Russia which is never safe from a Getic ambush. I cultivate the walls of Kraków, and care for my sick body, since the water still makes me swell.\(^{376}\)

\[T L \ 6. \ 81-88\]

It is now Kmita, not Janicki, who needs the excuses for having written nothing (as in *TL 3*). Despite the fact that Janicki is excusing him, the terms in which he does so once again place Kmita outside of the group of *amici* that Janicki has

\(^{376}\) The reference is to his dropsy.
constructed with his book of exile elegies. First, there is his expression *nil scribit, nil mittit*. On the surface, *nil scribit* is a matter-of-fact statement about Kmita’s lack of written correspondence. But throughout the *Tristium Liber* Janciki, like Ovid in the exile works, has laid express emphasis on the bonds of shared literary pursuits between colleagues and friends, and Kmita’s lack of writing and lack of communication opposes him to this group. Furthermore, epistolary correspondence was, for humanist poets and intellectuals, the cornerstone of their learned society of letters: it was the means by which *amicitia* was maintained and Latin eloquence was demonstrated. Kmita sends no letters, and therefore is placed outside of its cultivated society. Kmita is also unavailable because he is performing military action and detained by ‘great affairs’: these are two actions which disqualify him from belonging to the realm of elegiac discourse, which traditionally spurned martial conflict and the grand affairs of state for more individualized and personal ones. Kmita, then, is indeed far off from where Janicki was writing in a double sense.

The verses which follow (vv. 87-88) are more than a notification to Bonamico about the poet’s current location and state: it creates a link between Janicki’s adoption of the Ovidian exilic persona (through the mention of his sick body) and the poetic role he envisions it playing—a view filtered through the

---

*I mean only that he sends no letters as he is depicted in the poetry by Janicki. We know for a fact that the ‘real’ Kmita corresponded with various humanists throughout Europe. In the context of both the poem and the collection as a whole, however, I claim Janicki’s assertion that Kmita “does not write anything” contrasts him with Janicki’s other addressees and choice of pursuits.*
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traditional conceptualization of the exilic Ovid as a bringer of literary civilization. Note Janicki’s choice of *colimus*: it could, of course, be read as a simple assertion of his residence (i.e. “I am living in Kraków”), but in light of the exilic Ovid’s deployment of the verb and its derivatives (like *cultus*) it is hard not to attribute to Janicki a similar sentiment. Depicting himself as sent forth by the instrument of his own cultivation (Bonamico), he will now pay forward the civilizing gift of the Muses, as a latter day exilic Ovid. What’s more he will do it in the absence of Kmita, in the capital, in the very heart of his emerging nation.

The more overt expressions of political ideology to which I alluded above arise at the end of the poem, in the form of a notification of current events which preserves the literary fiction of the epistolary form. Janicki recounts the recent political upheavals in Hungary caused by the death of King Jan I Zapolya, the regency of his infant son, and the siege of Buda undertaken by the Holy Roman Emperor Ferdinand I. Waiting for the chance to pounce is the Ottoman Sultan, whom Zapolya had controversially enlisted as an ally against the Holy Roman Empire, and who had placed the city and queen-dowager under his protection

---

378 In fact, in the verse which follows, Janicki writes *patronum subsequar*: the question which arises in my reading of the text is whether to understand this as simply “I will follow my patron” or as something that has more bite, such as “I will succeed my patron” i.e. supplant him here in Kraków. It is in the section that follows this statement that Janicki begins to politicize the poetry of the *Tristium Liber*.

379 Ferdinand I had claimed the throne of Hungary for his own since 1526, when a rump Diet named him King. Hungary’s political situation was of interest to the Poles because Hungary served as a buffer zone between themselves and the Ottomans, and also because the queen-consort of Hungary and mother of the infant king was Isabella Jagiellon, daughter of Zygmunt I and Bona Sforza.
by marshalling a large contingent of troops along the Danube. Janicki highlights
the infighting of the Christian princes (vv. 93-98) and the need to unite in the face
of the growing Ottoman threat, about which he writes:

Quam male Caesareo fratri sociisque timemus,
Barbaricas animo cum reputamus opes,
Quas tremit, ut tremuit Romanas ante secures
Telluris, qua te verteris, omne latus,
Utque cadant fractae, Deus et fortuna necesse est
Coniungant vires totaque terra simul.

How terribly we fear for the Emperor’s brother and his allies,
when we think upon the barbarian’s might,
before which trembles, as it trembled before the Roman fuses,
every reach of the earth, wherever you turn;
and so that it [i.e. his power] might fall broken, God and fortune must 
conjoin their powers and the whole eath at once.

(TL 6. 107-112)

The infighting depicted forms a parallel with the Polish political situation and
establishes a contrast to the ideal relations exemplified by Janicki and Bonamico.
It was the disagreement of the Hungarian nobles that led to the conflict in the
first place: some of them sided with Ferdinand, some with Zapolya. But more
important is the fact that their unrest has left them weak and unable to fend off
the looming threat of the Ottomans. Janicki draws attention to an important
political issue in which he sees his model of civilized and reciprocal interpersonal
relationship as potentially effective. He expands his own model outward into the
political sphere, making his push for a unified Europe (which first necessitates a
unanimous Poland). 380

Janicki’s earlier mention of Kmita in TL 6 shows the latter in an
imminently powerful military and political role. Kmita would be at the top of the
list of personalities (either of those mentioned in the elegies or not) who would
possess the ability to make a difference in the situation which Janicki describes,
and who would be integral in Poland’s avoidance of a fate similar to that of
Hungary. He is here the ideal reader of the message Janicki crafts in his role as
praeeceptor amicitiae.

2c. Tristium Liber 7: Poet as cultor

The seventh elegy of the Tristium Liber, entitled De se ipso ad posteritatem
(“About the poet himself to posterity”), has received the most attention of any of
the poems in the collection due to its autobiographical content. It is clearly
inspired by Tr. 4.10, the exilic Ovid’s own ‘autobiography.’ 381 Janicki is quick to
describe his birth in terms that align his own life with that of Ovid. Both poets’
compositions begin similarly with a short address to a future reader who is eager

---

380 This particular emphasis is elaborated in TL 8, the most political of the Tristium Liber’s elegies.
381 This poem belongs to a tradition of Renaissance autobiographical letters to posterity largely
inspired by Tr. 4.10. On this tradition, which I mentioned briefly in my introduction, see
Descoings (“Postérité”), who begins from Petrarch and Boccacio. Both Dopp (“Autobiographies”) and
Amherdt (“La postérité d’Ovide”) have both recently published on the poetic autobiography
of 16th century German Humanist Johannes Fabricius Montanus in relation to Tr. 4.10.
to know of the poet’s life (the *studiosus lector*). Both poets then proceed, naturally, by recounting their respective births:

*Sulmo mihi patria est, gelidis uberrimus undis,*
*  *milia qui novies distat ab urbe decem.*
*editus hic ego sum, nec non, ut tempora noris,*
*  *cum cecidit fato consul uterque pari:*
*si quid id est, usque a proavis vetus ordinis heres*
*  *non modo fortunae munere factus eques.*
*nec stirps prima fui; genito sum fratre creatus,*
*  *qui tribus ante quater mensibus ortus erat.*

Sulmo is my homeland, fertile with chilly streams,
which lies ninety miles from the city.
Here was I brought forth, and so you may know the time,
it was when both consuls succumbed to a like fate.
For what it’s worth, I was inheritor of a rank from my forefathers of old,
rather than a knight newly created by fortune’s gift.
Nor was I the first born son; I was made after my brother’s birth,
who was born twelve months before.

*(Tr. 4.10.3-10)*

*Alta iacent supra Snenanas rura paludes,*
*  *Ianusci nomen nescio cuius habent,*
*Qua nostri quondam reges fecisse secundum*
*  *A Gnesna in Prussos saepe feruntur iter.*
*Haec meus assueto genitor versabat aratro,*
*  *Vir bonus et modicas inter honestus opes.*
*Is dum peste gravi natos sibi luget ademptos,*
*  *Quae foede nostros tunc popularat agros,*
*Me genitum medio luctu sibi vidit et orbus*
*  *Transegit menses non nisi forte decem.*

A high country lies above the swamps of Žnin
named after some Januszek, I know not whom,
through which our kings are often said to have made successful
journeys from Gniezno into Prussia.
This earth my father turned with his familiar plow,
a man good and honest, and of modest means.
While he wept for sons stolen from him by an oppressive plague
which was then ravaging our region,
he saw me born in the midst of his weeping, and he
only passed about ten months without a son.

*(TL 7.5-14)*

Janicki draws attention to his watery homeland, just as Ovid does, and does so
for the same purposes. Both of their native countries reflect the circumstances of
their current situations: Ovid was born to icy waters, and likewise he has been
consigned to the icy waters (as he characterizes them) of the Black Sea and the
frozen rivers which empty into it; Janicki’s watery homeland draws a parallel
with his watery disease, the *hydrops*, whose inflamations cause him to swell with
fluid. Both locales are marked by their distances on routes which connect them to
the founding locations of their respective cultures (Rome and Gniezno).\(^{382}\) Janicki
also parallels the time of his birth with that of Ovid, in that they were both born
in the midst of national calamities: Ovid’s birth is marked by the defeat of the
senatorial forces led by Hirtius and Pansa at Mutina, and Janicki is born during a
plague, as his father mourns for the children he has lost. Both poets characterize
their births in such a manner to display that they were born into mourning, and

---

\(^{382}\) In Slavic myth, Lech, the progenitor of the Polish people and their realm (*Lechia*), created a
settlement and called it Gniezno (‘Nest’) because it was there that he saw, against the backdrop of
a red and setting sun, the white eagle that he was hunting. The white eagle is, of course, still a
prominent symbol of the Polish people.
that the querulous tone of their respective *Tristia* is present in their genetic make-up. Janicki’s mention of prior children also aligns him in birth order with the exilic Ovid as a younger son.

Janicki constructs these similarities to bring into high relief the contrast of their respective stations: Ovid is old-money gentry, while Janicki is a country farmer’s son. Both poets couch their assertions about their family fortunes in ethical terms, though Janicki is more overt. Ovid’s *si quid id est* (“if it is anything” or “for what it’s worth,” v. 7) casts a long shadow of doubt upon the value of the station of his birth. Janicki complements this by describing his father as *vir bonus et modicas inter honestus opes* (“a man good and honest, and of modest means,” v. 10): he uses a loaded term, *vir bonus*, usually reserved for the Roman nobility, to describe his farmer father, and situates his father’s ethical goodness (*honestus*) in relation to his meager fortunes, explicitly linking the two. As in *TL* 1, Janicki offers an objection to the prevailing morality which declares birth, wealth, or appearance to be markers or guarantors of moral rectitude.³⁸³ Furthermore, the station of his birth underpins his political sentiments: it is entirely understandable that Janicki would employ a posture sympathetic to the increasingly high costs inflicted upon the peasant and burgher classes in the resultant anarchy of the assault of the Polish gentry on both the Church and the Crown.

³⁸³ See pp. 181-183 above, where *cultus* and morality are linked.
I do not wish to focus, however, on the historical facts of Janicki’s upbringing, but rather on how he uses the poem to construct his poetic persona as a civilizing cultivator of Muses and men, aligning his own purpose with that of Bonamico as it was characterized in the previous poem. He exploits his plebian origins to this effect: just as the concrete reality of Janicki’s illness allowed him to manipulate the Ovidian equation of exile with death and illness, so too the fact that he is a farmer’s son enables him, through an equation of reality with metaphor, to place himself in the role of the Ovidian *cultor*.\(^{384}\)

With Janicki, there is a certain truth to the adage, “Like father, like son.” Janicki does indeed become a cultivator like his father, but not in the conventional manner. When his father’s profession is introduced (v. 9), Janicki employs a clever pun that points at his own chosen profession: *versabat*. As his father *verso*-ed, so too will he: as the ploughman makes his *versus* (‘furrows’), the poet turns his own *versus* (‘lines’).\(^{385}\) To make this difference clear, Janicki’s role as *cultor* is then dissociated from the agricultural realm at vv. 23-6:

\[
\begin{align*}
Nempe pater, quia me nimis indulgenter habebat, \\
Vivere me durum noluit inter opus, \\
Ne terna informi manus attereretur aratro,
\end{align*}
\]

\(^{384}\) Janicki, as the first true plebe-poet in a gentry dominated society, found himself in a unique position to perform such a manipulation.

\(^{385}\) For an interesting modern *comparandum* of this same idea, see Seamus Heaney’s poem “Digging” from his collection *Death of a Naturalist* (London: Faber, 1966), from which I have excerpted the following: “Between my finger and my thumb / The squat pen rests; snug as a gun. / Under my window a clean rasping sound / When the spade sinks into the gravelly ground: / My father digging.... / But I’ve no spade to follow men like them. / Between my finger and my thumb / The squat pen rests. / I’ll dig with it.”
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Of course my father, since he handled me too indulgently, did not want me to live amidst hard labor, lest my tender hand be worn by the misshapen plow, or lest the summer heat scorch my soft cheeks with its fire. (TL 7.23-6)

Compare v. 25 with v. 9 from above. The structural similarities of the two lines, with *aratro* and its attributive adjective in the same case and position, invite them to be read against one another. For Janicki’s father, the plow was *assuetus* (“familiar”), whereas for the young Janicki it is *informis*—not only misshapen, but also repulsive.

These two distichs are, of course, a traditional characterization of the elegiac poet as soft and unsuited to harsh labor. They also place Janicki alongside the Ovid of *Tr.* 4.10, in that both poets present themselves as unsuited for (or unenthusiastic towards) the lots to which they each were born: Ovid is unsuited for the magisterial positions befitting a Roman *eques*; Janicki’s physical composition makes him unfit for life behind the plow. The roles that the fathers of the young poets play in their respective developments are in direct contrast, however. In *Tr.* 4.10, Ovid’s father finds fault with his son’s lack of

---

386 Both of their deficiencies, then, are depicted as lack of vigor, as Ovid writes of his balking at the prospect of becoming a senator: *maius erat nostris viribus illud onus* (“that burden was greater than my strength,” *Tr.* 4.10.36).
interest in political life, and is set in adversarial opposition to the poet. Janicki’s father, on the other hand, is not only open to his son studying poetry and the liberal arts, but is the main facilitator of his early education (see indulgenter, v.23).

It is tempting to see Janicki’s father placed in this role to contrast with Ovid’s because of his profession: he is a farmer, a proto-cultor; he represents the first step in the development of the concept of cultus presented by Janicki in this poem. With each progressive step, the meaning of what it is to be a ‘cultivator’ is altered, becoming increasingly abstract and metaphorical. Janicki’s peasant farmer father is a facilitator of spiritual growth and cultural development because he is predisposed by his condition (as an agricultural worker) to be facilitative of growth and development in the concrete sense. He is able to act as a springboard for his son’s chosen pursuits, whereas the aristocratic, wealth-minded father of Ovid cannot. By revealing this sort of interaction between Janicki and his poetic predecessor, I hope that I can produce a healthy skepticism towards Janicki’s ‘autobiography.’ I do not wish to say that TL 7 is entirely a fabrication (after all, the general stages of his education can be corroborated), but rather wish to point out that not every detail must immediately be considered truth. The fact that Janicki’s deployment of his father allows him such convenient

---

387 saepe pater dixit “studium quid inutile temptas? / Maecenides nullas ipse reliquit opes,” (“Often my father said, ‘Why you you pursue a useless course of study? Homer himself left no wealth behind,’” Tr. 4.10.21-2).
opportunity for interaction with Ovidian autobiography should cause the reader to take note that we may be entangled in a clever bit of poetic gamesmanship.\textsuperscript{388}

Implicit in the juxtaposition of the two poets’ fathers is an ethical critique of the seemingly conventional truth of Janicki’s day—namely that the wealthy gentry were the fosterers of culture simply because of their wealth and their employment of poetic clients. This sentiment may seem somewhat dangerous for a poet like Janicki, due to his reliance on patronage for his livelihood, but this political expression is hidden in highly lyrical poetry that is not, on its face, political and obfuscated by layers of comparison which would be apparent only to those who were familiar with his inspirational model. This sort of subtlety (I hesitate to say ‘encoding’) serves closely to connect the circle of learned amici that Janicki constructs by way of his poetry—a circle which may include sympathetic members of the gentry—linking them via learning and literary cultivation, rather than the conventional groupings by stratified social class. This, in an idealized way, frees the poetic enterprise from monetary concern: one does not need money to aid poetic production, but simply to be a cultor and amicus. Despite his

\textsuperscript{388} It is clear that Janicki embellishes his career elsewhere in the poem to create similarities between himself and Ovid. The best example of this is TL 7.121-4, wherein Janicki explains that some people misconceived his symptoms as signs of venereal disease, thinking he was entirely debauched (\textit{effusum in Venerem}, v. 121) because he was a lover of poetry and wit, or because he ‘wrote love poetry from the time when he was practically a boy’ (\textit{vel quia paene puer scriptor amoris eram}, v. 124). As Nadolski (‘Z Teki Humanistycznej,’ \textsuperscript{388}) points out, Janicki is no love poet; love plays little role in his poetry, and no love poetry is extant in any form. The epithet scriptor amoris is taken up from Ovid. Furthermore, Janicki’s ridiculous assertion that up until adulthood he drank only water (TL 7.118) can be set alongside Ovid’s \textit{Ex. P.} 1.10.30, \textit{scis mihi quam solae paene bibantur aquae} (“you know that I drank almost only water”) to show that Janicki is interacting with Ovid for poetic effect, and not being entirely truthful.
claimed plebian origins, Janicki is certainly no populist poet with a grudge against the aristocracy simply for their wealth; he is rather the proponent of a system of social and cultural interaction that can transcend such distinctions.

What follows makes it clear that Janicki chose to stay in the family business of cultivation; he will employ it, however, on the cultural level, progressing to the next stage in the development of *cultus* modeled on the use of the term in Ovid’s exile works:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Gymnasium petii, nuper Lubrancus amoeni} \\
ad \text{Vartae vitreas quod fabricarat aquas.} \\
\text{Hic quendam invenio magna cum laude docentem,}^{389} \\
\text{Quicquid habet Latium, Graecia quicquid habet,} \\
\text{Qui nostri curam laetus suscepit agelli,} \\
\text{Illum sincera percoluitque fide.} \\
\text{Tum primum nomen magni immortale Maronis} \\
\text{Audi et nomen, Naso beate, tuum.} \\
\text{Audivi, colere incepi dixique poetis} \\
\text{Post divos terras maius habere nihil.} \\
\text{Carmina cum pleno recitavi prima theatro,} \\
\text{Addideram menses ad tria lustra novem.}
\end{align*}
\]

30 35 40

I sought the gymnasium which Lubrański had recently founded near the glassy waters of pleasing Warta. Here I found someone worthy of great praise to teach me whatever Latium, whatever Greece holds; he happily undertook the care of our little farm and cultivated it with genuine trust. It was then I first heard the immortal name of great Maro, and your name too, Saint Ovid.\[390\]

---

389 Likely Kristof Hegendorf, expelled from Leipzig for favoring the Reformation, who settled in Poznan and taught at the Academy from 1530-6, but wound up having to resign after religious disputes. See Mosdorf’s entry on this line in “Commentarz.”
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I heard, and I began to cultivate and said that the earth has nothing greater than the poets, save the gods. I recited my first poems to a full house; I had added nine months to my three lustra.

(TL 7. 29-40)

Janicki employs the agricultural theme metaphorically as a segue by which he may depict his transformation from one born to be a cultivator of plants and animals into a cultivator of the Muses and learned men. He equates the education of his soul with care for a plot of land (agelli, v. 33), and chooses the verb percolere (‘to cultivate thoroughly’). He learns the new type of cultivation as his teacher sows his fields with the flower of Latin and Greek literature. The instrument of the cultivation is no longer the plow, as before, but sincera fides (‘genuine trust/loyalty,’ v. 34)—one of the core principles of the amicitia advocated by Janicki in the Tristium Liber thus far.391

Duly instructed, Janicki himself becomes the cultor (colere incepi, v. 37). The repetition of colere drives the point home: this is the process by which civilization is passed from one person to another, namely study of classical eloquence. The

390 Janicki’s choice to call Ovid beatus here is worth some consideration, since it seems entirely unfitting to call him ‘fortunate,’ particularly in a book of poems inspired by his exilic persona. This produces an interesting tension concerning what it means to be ‘blessed’ or ‘fortunate’ while in the unfortunate state of exile. It forces a re-evaluation of the term by the reader, which fits with my particular reading of this elegy. Furthermore, Janicki cleverly chooses ‘beatus’ which can also carry the meanings ‘copious’ or ‘abundant,’ and which would fit with the fact that Ovid is the author who inspired his poem, and that Ovid was reputed for his body of adaptable commonplaces. A English translation of ‘fertile’ might be able to reflect these shades of meaning and preserve the agricultural metaphor: Ovid is a fertile field for Janicki to plow (see verso, versare in v. 9 above).

391 This hearkens back to Janicki’s great offense at Kmita’s lack of faith in him and his breach of trust in TL 3.
distich at vv. 37-8 gives this assertion a moral resonance and establishes the familiar equation of Classical eloquence and individual piety, particularly when it is set in opposition to a similar couplet from *Tr. 4.10* (which comes from almost exactly the same place in the poem):

\[\text{temporis illius colui foviue poetas,}\
\quad \text{quotque aderant vates, rebar adesse deos.}\]

I cultivated and fostered the poets of that time, and whatever bards were present, I thought them present gods. (*Tr. 4.10.41-2*)

Here Ovid’s extreme poet worship verges on the blasphemous. Janicki makes an important moral modification to the famous exile’s proclamation. He, too, cultivates the poets, but makes it clear that they are placed behind the divine in respect to greatness (*post divos*, v. 38).

As before, Janicki’s career development keeps pace with that of Ovid in *Tr. 4.10*; both evolve from youths unsuited for their fathers’ worlds into precocious adolescent literary talents. Janicki claims that his first public recitation came when he was just shy of sixteen years old (v. 40), which parallels Ovid’s assertion at *Tr. 4.10.57-8* that “when [he] first read his first youthful poems in public, [his] beard had been cut once or twice.”

---

392 *Carmina cum primum populo iuvenalia legi / barba resecta mihi bisve semelve fuit*. Though the line Janicki pens does not verbally echo Ovid’s mention of his own age, it is, however, modeled on a line Ovid uses in the same poem in reference to his father: *Tr. 4.10.78*, *addiderat lustris altera lustra novem* (“he had added another nine *lustra* to his previous nine”).
Later in the poem, Janicki reaches the last stage of his development as a purveyor of the full range of *cultus*:

\[
Iudicio lectos colui constanter amicos,
\]
\[
Hos tantum veras credere doctus opes.
\]
\[
Si reditus nobis amplos fortuna dedisset,
\]
\[
Me, puto, splendidior nemo futurus erat
\]
\[
Munificusque magis. Laudare hinc illa solem
\]
\[
Romani vere regia verba ducis:
\]
\[
"Nil hodie dedimus cuiquam, prodegimus ergo
\]
\[
Istam, quod pudeat, perdidimusque diem."
\]

I loyally cultivated a select group of men who were, in my estimation, friends,

since I was taught to believe that these are one’s true wealth.

If fortune had given me ample returns,

I suppose no one would have been more illustrious than I,

and more dutiful. Here I am wont to praise those truly regal words of a Roman general:

“Today we have given nothing to anyone, therefore we have squandered the day, to our shame, and lost it.”

*(TL 7.103-110)*

After presenting himself as a child born (in respect to station) to be a cultivator of fields, and then as an adolescent cultivator of the Muses, in the passage above he depicts himself as a cultivator of a like-minded circle of friends. Janicki again returns to the verb *colere*, this time to describe his interactions with his *amici*. This group of friends is not all-inclusive: they must pass muster under the scrutiny of Janicki’s judgment (*iudicio*, v. 103) to become a member of the select group (*lectos*, v. 103). The source of the criteria for his judgment is his previous schooling,
which certifies him as a member of the *docti*, and he uses just that term to describe himself in v. 104. We as readers know from earlier in the elegy that the content of his education was the study of Latin and Greek literature (see vv. 31-2 above). At v. 104, Janicki presents an epitome of his entire curriculum. What was the lesson that Janicki took away from his study of the poets? Friends are one’s true wealth. This assertion offers a validation of Janicki’s own interpretation of Ovid’s exilic works and his choice to take them as his inspiration for the *Tristium Liber*. If Janicki truly holds the belief that the lessons learned from the study of Classical eloquence and poetry can be boiled down to the simple maxim that one’s *amici lecti* are what is of true worth, it makes sense that he would then choose as his nominal model the works which he felt best communicated that sentiment.

Janicki also proves himself to be an excellent student of this lesson that he has been taught: the adverbial *constanter* recalls the *sincera fides* (“genuine trust/loyalty”) which was the instrument of his own instruction in the cultivation of the Muses at v. 34 above. He shows that he has enacted the lessons he learned in his pursuit of the Muses and in his inter-personal relationships, putting poetic sentiment into action in the social world. Janicki then demonstrates that in his application of poetry to life, his ethical values are shifted.

---

393 There is also a nice verbal echo of the verb *docere* which connects the passage about Janicki’s education (vv. 31-2) with the passage under discussion: at v. 31, his teacher is described with the present participle *docentem*, and in v. 104, Janicki presents himself as the end result of this education by using the perfect passive participle *doctus* to describe himself.
in a manner that opposes them to the conventional ethics which value wealth and personal power. This is a more overt iteration of the ethical critique which surfaced when we compared the role of Janicki’s father with that of Ovid’s father above. Wealth is found in amici, and as we have seen throughout the exploration of Janicki’s book, an amicus is one who facilitates literary study and expression, which in turn leads the student to eventual cultivation of other like-minded men, creating an ever-widening circle of interconnected friendly relationships. Janicki expresses this moral attitude first in personal terms, and then more broadly by resorting to a locus communis at vv. 105-110. If only his illness would permit him to stay longer on the Earth, he claims, he would have been more noble and illustrious than all men, due to the number of friends he would have been able to incorporate into his circle. This produces a shift in the ethical value of the term splendidus (v. 106), an epithet with connotations of wealth and fame genuinely applied only to members of the nobility. Janicki hypothesizes that his poetry of friendship would have truly ennobled him in a way that birth and wealth could not. That Janicki understands the responsibilities of this ennobled position is driven home by the half-line enjambed in v. 107. He would have been not only splendidus, but most importantly, he would have been munificus: dutiful to his friends and aware of his social obligations to them—a concept which has been a key touchstone of the argument of the Tristium Liber. These two terms provide a moral outline, and a gloss on cultus: one is to be both splendidus and munificus; it
is not enough to be only the first—the fault of men like Kmita (as Janicki creates him in his poetry), and by extension, the Polish gentry for whom he stands. This is why Janicki calls the commonplace he chooses *vere regia verba* ("truly kingly words," v. 108): the sentiment they contain is the mark of a true nobility.

On the whole, the construction of *TL 7* as an epistle to posterity—or more accurately, to the future reader who is *studiosus* ("devoted; curious; fond of," see v. 1)—draws the reader of the collection into Janicki’s group, offering the receptive reader a place among Janicki’s circle of *amici*. The second person address found at the beginning of the elegy is little present throughout the narrative of Janicki’s poetic life, but it returns in the end to cap the poem.394

```
Haec et plura loquar de te, mea vita (quid autem
   Te potius, quam quod das mihi saepe, vocem?). 180
Ipse etiam praesens, olim cum veneris illo
   Annosus, propriis auribus ista bibes.395
Nam venies ad nos, venient quoscumque relinquo;
   Hic nulli aeternam fata dedere domum.
```

These and many other things I would say about you, my life,
(what else should I call you, than what you repeatedly give to me?).

394 Janicki has previously spoken in the second person to Jan Antonin at v. 133-4: *Antonine vale, vale Antonine tuumque / Te salvo salvum florat omne genus!* ("Farewell Antonin, farewell! With you safe, our whole race may flourish in safety!"). Following these lines there is more narration, where Antonin himself is talked about only in the third person. When the next second person address comes at the end of the poem, there is an ambiguity as to who the addressee actually is: the most recent second person addressee, Antonin, or the overall addressee of the whole poem, the *studiosus lector*. This ambiguity, I suspect, is intentional, as what Janicki writes in the three distichs that finish the elegy could apply equally to the specific address to Antonin as well as to the future reader of his poetry: Antonin repeatedly gives Janicki life in his medical interventions, and the future reader continually grants him life in his reading of his poetry. The use of the present tense *das* makes this reading possible.

395 This is an echo of *Tr*.3.5.14: *auribus illa bibi*. 253
Even you yourself, when in time you reach that place
   in the fullness of years, will be present and drink these words in by
your ears.
For you will come to us, and whomsoever else I leave behind;
   Here the fates grant no one an eternal home.
   (TL 7.179-184)

The *studiosus lector*, whoever and whenever he may be, repeatedly grants the
poet life by reading, and thereby is addressed as “my life” in the vocative. The
poet asserts in the face of death that he will live on through his poetry: a familiar
trope. But in his claim that the reader grants him life, Janicki places the *studiosus
lector* on the same level as the *amici* previously mentioned in his poems—like
Montano (*TL* 4), Bonamico (*TL* 6), and Antonin (*TL* 7)—who are all characterized
as *amici* through their efforts to preserve the life of the poet, and thereby facilitate
his literary endeavors. Janicki rhetorically co-opts the reader into his program of
cultivated friendship, and in doing so the transitional *haec et plura loquar de te*
takes on a deeper meaning: Janicki, as a friend, would find poetic inspiration in
the reader as well, which he would be more than happy to share once we reach
our final resting place (vv. 181-2). Janicki cites Ovid here in a reversal of
situation: at *Tr*. 3.5.14, Ovid’s *auribus illa bibi* is used in his description of a past
and tearful parting between Ovid and a new-found friend; Janicki’s *auribus ista
bibes* (v. 182) foreshadows a future (re)union of poet the poet and his reader. This
presents a reversal in the exilic Ovid’s common trajectory into the past for a more
efficacious one aimed at the future.
III. Conclusion

Klemens Janicki took up the Ovid of the *Tristia* and *Ex Ponto* as a critical model for the evaluation of the role that *amicitia* played and could potentially play, in the form of both artistic patronage and personal friendship, in his society. He adapts this persona for its new context: an intellectual culture steeped in Erasmian humanism and the Polish literary mythos which claimed Ovid as the antecedent of Polish Latin eloquence. Through manipulation and reversal of Ovidian tropes and expressions, he reinvigorates Ovid, reintroducing the exiled poet’s voice to the public world and removing it from the rhetorical silence which it constructs for itself; he attempts to reestablish it as an effective communicator in the ethical and political spheres—to succeed where the exile poems depict themselves as failing. He found in the exilic Ovid, on account of the ancient author’s combination of interpersonal relationships with the development of civilized culture, the best possible voice with which to put on display the idealized relationships of men belonging to the society of Latin letters, in the hope that they might serve as an example to the Polish gentry of his age. This produces a redirection of the concept of what it means to be ‘civilized’ that runs up against the prevailing moral outlook of those who held power in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Janicki, in writing his own *Tristia*, made use of the exile’s subtle irony and ambiguity to subvert the presence of the authority
of a powerful man like Kmita, whose presence looms over Janicki’s poetic
practice both before and after his falling out with his patron.

In his essay in his 2007 volume *Writing Exile*, Jan Felix Gaertner boldly
asks, “How exilic is Ovid’s exile poetry?” In his paper, he outlines the recent
arguments that have led critics of Ovid’s exile works to the conclusion that
“Ovid’s exile is a *condicio sine qua aliter* for the form and content” of Ovid’s exile
poems, that Ovid’s change in condition brought about a complete change in his
poetry as it was reconditioned to the new fact of his exile.\textsuperscript{396} Gaertner argues
that these works of Ovid are rather a reworking of a pre-existing literary
tradition, and not unique to Ovid’s personal state. Klemens Janicki offers to
readers a post-Ovidian instance of this literary tradition, and due to the fact that
he was never a political exile of any sort, also presents us with a reading of
Ovid’s exilic poems that does not focus on the condition of exile as the requisite
condition for the poetry. The discovery of such a rich body of poetry written in
an exilic pose by a non-exile grants the reader permission to look backwards into
Ovid’s exilic poems for broader poetic and cultural concerns, untethered by the
immediate historical circumstance of the ancient poet’s transplantation to Tomis.
In a sense, a work like Janicki’s *Tristium Liber* offers something of an answer to
Gaertner’s question, or at least provides us with a clear example of another

\textsuperscript{396} *Writing Exile*, 156.
reading of the exile works that places its focus on other issues in the poetry besides their author’s biography.

As we have seen in our earlier examination of the Renaissance commentaries, much ink is spilled over the origins and circumstances of Ovid’s exile; he is read as a storehouse of general knowledge of the ancient world and myth, and as a repository of rhetorical teaching. Literary critique is left to Ovid’s poetic followers, as they cultivate him just like he cultivated the poets who came before him. Janicki’s efforts at the reincorporation of the Ovidian exile persona into an ethical dialogue might even be read as an effort to rehabilitate contemporary readings of the exile poems, to prevent them from becoming isolated as ‘exile poems’ — idiosyncratic and overly focused on a particular historical instant (as Gaertner seems to suggest recent criticism has done). Janicki makes use of the Ovidian exile persona to save it from what he saw as the exile’s own rhetoric of irrelevance. Janicki styles himself as an amicus to the exilic Ovid, in a way that none of the addressees of the Tristia or Ex Ponto could be, by placing him once again in society where his message, filtered through Janicki, may be heard.

397 An example of such a (roughly) contemporary reading is suggested by Hexter (“Medieval Exilic Imaginary,” 233) in his discussion of the dialogue between Reason and Sorrow in two essays (2.67 and 2.125) in Petrarch’s De Remediis utriusque fortunae: “[A]lthough the structure and tone of these dialogues are fairly consistent throughout the entire De Remediis, here, the refrain-like nature of Sorrow’s complaints might at least be imagined as a less-than-entirely-sympathetic reader’s take on the individual elegies in the Tristia and Epistulae ex Ponto as a series of slight variations on a single, self-pitying theme.”
CHAPTER 5: TOO MUCH LIKE THE REAL THING: DU BELLAY’S LATIN

ELEGIES AND OVID’S EXILE POEMS

“‘When you are in Paris, think of yourself in New York longing for Paris and everything will be fine.’”

— André Aciman, “Square Lamartine” from False Papers

I. Introduction

In 1553, the famous Pléiade poet Joachim du Bellay was compelled to leave his native home in Anjou for the caput mundi, the city of Rome. Du Bellay suffered no political persecution; his sojourn arose out of financial need and familial duty. He accepted the job of administering the household of his cousin, the Cardinal Jean du Bellay, who was tasked with pleading the cause of the French at the court of Pope Julius III. The Eternal City became fertile ground for du Bellay’s poetic production: alongside his Antiquités de Rome and a significant portion of the sonnets contained in his most famous work, Les Regrets, du Bellay penned poems in Latin, comprised mostly of elegies and epigrams, published in

a collection called *Poemata* in 1558. The elegies are primarily of two types: one group, entitled *Amores*, are love elegies revolving around a woman named Faustina; the other group is made up of epistolary and querulous poetry, written at Rome, with primarily the *Tristia* and *Ex Ponto* as its model.

A selection of these latter Roman elegies will be the focus of this chapter. At the present time, the assertion of Kenneth Lloyd-Jones still holds largely true, namely that interest in these elegies “has waned to the point that, in our day, they are politely, even sympathetically, referred to by scholarly critics, but, one suspects, not widely read,” and that they have “as a whole become erudite curiosities.”

I will demonstrate by way of an analysis of a selection of these Roman elegies how du Bellay employs Ovid’s exilic persona not simply as a means to

---

399 Though *Les Regrets* are also modeled on the *Tristia* (in fact, du Bellay himself refers to them as such, calling the poems his *tristia* in Epigram 7 of the *Poemata*), this collection of 191 sonnets in vernacular French lies far beyond the scope of the present work. For discussion of how these relate to the exilic corpus of Ovid see both George Hugo Tucker, *Homo Viator*, (Geneva: Droz, 2003), 239-267, to whom my own approach toward du Bellay’s exilic persona is deeply indebted, as well as Stephen Hinds, “Black Sea Latin, Du Bellay, and the Barbarian Turn,” in *Two Thousand Years of Solitude: Exile After Ovid*, ed. Jennifer Ingleheart (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), which focuses primarily on the role of language in the two poets’ respective compositions. The original study on and listing of the similarities between the Latin and French texts appears in Henri Chamard, *Joachim Du Bellay, 1522-1560*, (Lille: Université de Lille, 1900), 360n5. I should also note that I was aided greatly by the excellent and thought-provoking commentary contained in Geneviève Demerson, ed. and trans., *Joachim du Bellay: Œuvres poétiques viii: Œuvres Latines: Poemata*, (Paris: Librarie Nizet, 1984) on du Bellay’s *Poemata*. All texts of du Bellay come from the edition of Demerson. I should also note that Demerson’s essays on du Bellay’s Latin poetry have been collected into *Joachim du Bellay et la belle romaine* (Orléans: Paradigme, 1996).

express his displeasure at his compulsory residence in Rome and at his separation from his homeland, but primarily as a tool with which to explore the Renaissance humanist idealization and privileging of the physical site of Rome and to establish himself in the aesthetic space of nostalgia created by Ovid in the *Tristia* and *Ex Ponto*. This is part of an effort undertaken by du Bellay to shift the way in which the ancient world is imagined with regard to its inspiration of contemporary poetry. He utilizes Ovid’s exilic voice to critique humanist uses of ancient poetry that he sees as bland and too derivative. He also takes up the exilic pose to position himself not merely as an exile caught between the past and the present and geographically removed from his homeland, but rather as an artist caught between an idealized past and future, between an idealized Rome and France, and between an idealized ancient literary tradition and a new vernacular one. This is a means by which to carve out a unique nostalgic space for his own literary production and to develop an autonomous poetic identity that is inspired by the ancients, but free from the shackles of slavish imitation.

I develop my discussion of du Bellay’s poetry in two parts: by briefly evaluating Ovid as an author of nostalgic poetry and discussing how he creates

---

401 There is some element of poetic rivalry in this act, which is pointed to by IJsewijn (“Patriae Desiderium,” 248).
402 This is a typically humanist situation of one’s literary self (cf. Petrarch, especially *De Remediis Utriusque Fortuna* 1, *Epistolae Familiares* 6.2)
403 A similar approach, but with regard to Ovid and du Bellay’s *Regrets*, can be found in M.-D. Legrande, "Exil et poésie: les *Tristes* et les *Pontiques* d'Ovid, les *Souspirs* d'O. de Magny, Les *Regrets* de J. Du Bellay," *Littératures* 17 (1987).
in the exile poetry what I have called an ‘aesthetic patria,’ that is, a space for poetic expression, disconnected from the real world and located entirely within the literary realm. The second section deals directly with Joachim du Bellay, where I will analyze four poems from the Poemata. First, I demonstrate how in the dedicatory epigram to the collection and Elegy 1 du Bellay evoked exilic tropes and themes found in the Tristia and Ex Ponto to firmly establish the exilic Ovid as his literary model. There follows an investigation of Elegy 2 of the collection, which focuses on du Bellay’s attitudes towards the site of Rome and humanist nostalgia for the ancient city and its literary productions. The final poem examined is the most widely-known of the Latin elegies, Elegy 7, entitled Patriae desiderium. This poem represents du Bellay’s effort to fully inhabit the ‘aesthetic patria’ created by Ovid and establish within it his own poetic space and identity, in part through competition with the ancient exile poet.

The claim that du Bellay offers with his Latin elegies a critique of earlier humanist uses of ancient poetry necessitates some degree of context. While a full discussion of du Bellay in relation to his Neo-Latin poetic predecessors would surely constitute its own study, I want to provide, at least in passing, examples of the types of works to which du Bellay may be reacting. The first obvious place to begin is with Petrarch. Du Bellay knew Petrarch well, and admired him greatly as a vernacular poet; his collection L’Olive (1549) is made up of Petrarchan sonnets, the first of their kind in the French language. Petrarch also
lurks beneath the surface of du Bellay’s literary self-situating. Du Bellay’s Roman elegies may appear at first glance to belong to the genre of lament for a lost, glorious past that makes the present state of Rome pale in comparison—a genre established in the writings of Petrarch (*De Remediis Utriusque Fortunae* 1, *Epistolae Familiaris* 6.2) and his intellectual descendant Poggio Bracciolini (see *Historiae de varietate Fortunae*, Book 1). There is something much more psychological, however, about du Bellay’s poetic interactions with this lost and ancient past, and Ovid’s *Tristia* and *Ex Ponto* offer insights into this psychological framework. Du Bellay begins from this Petrarchan pose towards Rome, particularly in *Romae descriptio* (Elegy 2), in order to both mock it and, in effect, top it with his own literary vision of the better, self-made artistic *patra* that grows out of his Ovidian model. With regard to the ‘bland’ Latin poetry that du Bellay may have had in mind, Petrarch’s Latin verse compositions left much to be desired, particularly in terms of innovation. They were by and large unsuccessful, particularly the much-belaboured and highly derivative *Africa*, which took its content from Petrarch’s own reconstructions of Livy and its metrics, rhetorical foundation, and palette of emotional expression from Vergil’s *Aeneid*.

---

*404* See n. 402 above.
*405* Poggio studied under Petrarch’s protégé, Giovanni Malpaghino.
*406* This is part of the focus of section 2b, on *Romae descriptio*, below.
Also worth considering are the *Eclogae Piscatoriae* of Jacopo Sannazaro (1457-1530).\(^{408}\) According to Demerson, the composition of bucolics modeled on Sannazaro (and Andrea Navagero) was a common practice of the circle which du Bellay frequented in Rome.\(^{409}\) Sannazaro’s sea-side pastorals attempt a wholesale transplant of the Vergilian idyl by dropping the *Eclogues* into the Bay of Naples, Sannazaro’s home. Despite the change in scenery, however, Sannazaro develops the Vergilian model hardly at all, following it exceedingly closely in both form and content, and clings to the traditional subjects: singing contests, querulous lovers, a mourning dirge, etc. Perhaps this lack of innovation is why Sannazaro was so keen to defend the originality of his work. In Eclogue 4, he writes:

\[
\begin{align*}
    nunc litoream ne despice Musam \\
    quam tibi post silvas, post horrida lustra Lycae \\
    (si quid id est) salsas deduxi primus ad undas, \\
    ausus inexperta tentare pericula cymba.
\end{align*}
\]

Now, do not look down upon the shoreline Muse whom, after the forests, after the grim wilds of Lycaeus, (for what it is worth) I have led down for you to the salty sea, daring to try dangerous waters in my untested boat.

\((Ecl. Pisc. 4.17-20)\)^{410}

Sannazaro’s claims also ignore certain *Idylls* of Theocritus (6, 11, 21), in which the Alexandrian poet leads his bucolic Muse to sea-side subjects, and which

\[^{408}\text{These were first printed in } De partu virginis libri iii. Eclogae v. Salices. De Morte Christi (Naples, 1526), and done so, interestingly, on parchment.}\]

\[^{409}\text{Demerson, “Oeuvres Latines,” 251.}\]

\[^{410}\text{He repeats this in his elegies, at 3.2.57-8: } quandoquidem salsas descendi ego primus ad undas, / ausus inexpertis reddere verba sonis (“Since I first descended to the salty sea, I have dared to render words in untested strains”).}\]
Sannazaro undoubtably knew well. It is also worth noting, with a view to du Bellay’s potential interaction with Sannazaro’s poems in the Roman elegies, how v. 19 above echoes Tr. 3.7.15. Furthermore, it is agreed, through the use of internal references within the poems, that Sannazaro wrote some of the Eclogae while living as an exile in France with King Federico II of Naples.411

Though du Bellay’s Latin elegies are greatly inspired by Ovid, their originality is not to be questioned. They are highly enjoyable in their own right, and du Bellay’s command of the Latin tongue is evident: he writes in a unique and simple style, and the pleasureable ease with which his poetry may be read cannot be claimed by a great number of his contemporaries. He carries over from Ovid a delightful sense of skeptical irony, as well as the ancient poet’s well-organized rhetorical structure and penchant for learned mythological allusion. Despite his fame as a poet of the French vernacular, du Bellay’s Latin writings have received relatively little focused scholarly attention, especially in English. In fact it was only in 2004 that the first translations of any of his Latin poems into English appeared, and these represent only a portion of his entire Latin œuvre.412

That du Bellay chose to write in Latin at all deserves at least minor discussion at the outset. In 1549, he gave pen to what is now seen as the founding document of the Pléiade, a group of poets who dedicated themselves to glorifying the French language through vernacular poetry which adopted Classical style and forms.\footnote{The two other major poets who stood alongside du Bellay in this endeavor were Pierre de Ronsard and Jean-Antoine de Baïf. The name for their movement, of course, stemmed from the Alexandrian Pleiad of the 3rd c. B.C.E. On the Pléiade, the monumental, four-volume work of Herni Chamard, *Histoire de la Pléiade*, (1939; reprint, Paris: Didier, 1961) remains of great value.} In this work, *La Deffence et Illustration de la Langue Francoyse*, du Bellay rejected the idea that French was not a suitable medium for higher forms of poetry and repudiated poets who resorted to Latin for their more serious works.\footnote{Just what du Bellay means by the term ‘illustration’—something like ‘enrichment’—and the problems presented by imitation is the subject of a valuable discussion contained in Terrence Cave, *The Cornucopian Text: Problems of Writing in the French Renaissance* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1979). “In the defense, du Bellay identifies two main enemies of the French language. First there are ignorant writers who use French. Second are learned ones who don’t, who choose instead to write in Latin. Neither can be expected to enrich French in the ways du Bellay thinks necessary,” (Helgerson, *Joachim du Bellay*, 23). Du Bellay also pokes fun at the loftiness of Latin in a poem published only months after the *Defense*, entitled “A Madame Marguerite, d’escrire en sa langue.”} His decision, therefore, to begin writing in Latin when in his Roman exile came as a surprise to his fellow poets, particularly to fellow Pléiade member Pierre Ronsard.\footnote{Du Bellay addresses Ronsard’s dismay in Latin Elegy 6 and *Regrets* 10, citing Ovid’s adoption of the barbarian tongue while in exile as his excuse (see Hinds, “Black Sea Latin”).}

Chamard takes a pragmatic view of du Bellay’s sudden about-face, citing the poet’s new social situation and desire for acceptance within the humanist circles of Rome as the prime cause for his artistic choice.\footnote{Du Bellay, 359.} So too does Harold Lawton, claiming that there existed in du Bellay the desire “to build up a
reputation as a leading neo-Latin poet.‖ But these statements lack an important caveat: mainly, that du Bellay’s quest for the approval of his new-found Roman peers is not the obsequious plea of a suppliant seeking admittance to the altar of the Latin Muses; he rather seeks to earn his reputation as a rival rather than as a companion, and is more prepared to break down walls than build bridges. In essence, the alienation he expresses in his exilic elegies belongs more to the iconoclast than to the social misfit. At times, not even du Bellay’s inspiration, Ovid, is safe from this competitive impulse.

Stephen Hinds (2011) has explicitly related du Bellay’s shift in idiom and attitude to the influence of Ovid and the Tristia, showing how du Bellay adopts the exilic Ovid as a model for linguistic change: just as Ovid depicted his native Latin becoming less and less familiar while he was stranded amongst the barbarians, even to the point that he claims to have written poetry in the local Getic, so too has du Bellay been affected by his Roman surroundings, his exile compelling him to write in a language which he once refused.418 This is but one

418 It should be mentioned here that the seeds for such a discussion can be found in Geneviève Demerson, "Joachim Du Bellay et le Modèle Ovidien," in Colloque présence d’Ovide, ed. R. Chevalier (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1982), 288-9, as well as in Alvar A. Ezquerra, Exilio y Elegía Latina: Entre la Antigüedad y el Renacimiento (Huelva: Universidad de Huelva, 1997), 99-119, neither of whom are mentioned by Hinds. Du Bellay in his epigram Ad Lectorem, characterizes the Latin language as his mistress; the Gallic tongue is his wife: Gallica Musa mihi est, fatoir, quod nupta marito: / pro domina colitur Musa Latina mihi ("My French Muse is, I confess, like a wife to a husband: / I cultivate for a mistress my Latin one"). This eroticized depiction leaves the Amores of Faustina wide-open for a meta-poetical reading centering on his use of the Latin tongue, as opposed to reading them as a chronicle of some real love affair.
way in which du Bellay makes use of the persona Ovid takes up in his exile poems.

The collection

Before proceeding further, a brief overview of du Bellay’s book of poetry is necessary, as well as a rationale for my selections from it. The Latin elegies are contained in the first of the Poemata’s four books, which Jozef IJsewijn calls “a self-contained work of art, namely a cycle of nine poems: eight elegies and a hexametric Eclogue. These poems are not arranged chronologically... but by a much finer artistic principle. They describe namely the poetic and psychological development of the poet during his departure to the land of the Latins.”419 As is to be expected, a short dedicatory epigram, written to du Bellay’s patroness, Princess Marguerite of France, begins the collection. Elegy 1, entitled Cur intermissis Gallicis Latine scribat (“Why he writes in Latin, while French is abandoned”), describes the poet’s journey from France to Italy and the hardships that it presented. Due to the fact that both of these poems help to establish the exilic Ovid as a model for du Bellay’s poetic persona, I have chosen to adddress them in detail.

Elegy 2, Romae descriptio (“The description of Rome”), is also one of those examined closely by this study. What is on the surface a travel guide to Roman monuments and statuary, I argue, gives way to a more realistic disillusionment with Rome and its environs. This poem is integral in my reading for its ability to demonstrate du Bellay’s attitude towards the idealization of Rome.

Elegies 3, 4, 5, and 6 are not presented in what follows. Elegy 3, addressed to Jean d’Avanson, King Henry II’s ambassador to the Pope, recounts the reception of said ambassador in Rome by the personified Tiber. Ancient Father Tiber speaks to d’Avanson of the faded glory and ruined state of Rome, but prophesies that d’Avanson’s arrival heralds the coming of a new revival of Rome’s Empire, this time with France and her King at its head. It is the best source in the collection for du Bellay’s hopes for an as yet unrealized future for his native country; the sentiments within the elegy, however, can at times seem contradictory: du Bellay is all at once an aggressive imperialist and hopeful for peace.

Elegy 4 picks up a theme common to 16th-century Latin elegy, De pace inter principes Christianos ineunda (“On the necessity of peace between Christian princes”) against the Ottoman Turks.420 Though the tone is in places less optimistic, it once again takes up the idea of a new French empire conjoined with

---

420 Indeed, it is even found in Janicki’s Tristium Liber, specifically TL 8 and 9. In 1552, while du Belay was in Rome, the Ottomans made an incursion into Hungary, sparking much debate within the papal court over what was to be done; du Bellay was privy to much of this. See Dickinson, Du Bellay in Rome, 124.
Rome; this short poem was written, however, prior to Elegy 3 in the chronology.\footnote{Demerson, “Oeuvres Latines,” 236.}

Elegy 5, \textit{In vitae quietioris commendationem ad I. Morellum} (“In praise of a more peaceful life, to Jean de Morel”), engages closely with the sufferings of exile while praising Morel’s learning. It begins with the provocative \textit{Foelix qui patrio vivit contentus agello, / Nec timidas captat semper avarus opes} (“Happy is he who lives in his homeland, content with his acre, and is not always greedily grasping at elusive wealth”).\footnote{The expression \textit{foelix qui} will return in my discussion of Elegy 7 below. The gesture may be to Vergil, \textit{G. 2.490: felix qui potuit rerum cognoscere causas} (“Happy is he who can recognize the causes of things”); this man is happy because he “casts all fear and inexorable fate beneath his foot,” quite possibly a meta-poetical statement about the writing of the \textit{Georgics}.} Despite this fact, I have omitted it from what follows in the opinion that the greater part of its interactions with the exilic persona could be adequately covered in the much longer and more detailed Elegy 7.

Elegy 6 is a verse epistle to one of the period’s most well-known vernacular poets, du Bellay’s compatriot Pierre de Ronsard, “Prince of the French Lyre” (\textit{Ad P. Ronsardum lyrae Gallicae principem}). The poem praises Ronsard’s Muse and regrets their separation, as du Bellay contrasts his present poor circumstances with the favorable situation of his colleague. I do not discuss it in detail here for much the same reason as I have eschewed Elegy 5.\footnote{A suitable \textit{comparandum} to Elegy 6 is poem 10 of the \textit{Regrets}, also addressed to Ronsard. This poem is discussed in Hinds, “Black Sea Latin,” 70-71.}
Elegy 7, *Patriae desiderium* (“Longing for my homeland”) is treated in detail in what follows. As its title suggests it is the locus for much interaction with both nostalgia as a concept and the persona of the exilic narrator.

In Elegy 8 (*Veronis; in fontem sui nominis ad lac. Spiffanium Episc. Nivernens* or “Veronis: on a spring named for her, to Jacques Spifame, Bishop of Nevers”), du Bellay speaks in the voice of the Latin nymph Veronis, recounting her birth and her attempted rape by Benacus.\(^{424}\) He tells how, in her flight to escape the lusty lake god, she made it to safety and made a home south of Sens—within the dedicatee’s domain. The poem’s presence is somewhat strange, as it is highly influenced by the *Metamorphoses*, and seems somewhat out of place. We know that the poem achieved a great success and that it was circulated separately, published on its own before the publication of the entire collection.\(^{425}\) Its prior popularity and its seeming discontinuity may point to its inclusion in the collection as a way to increase its sales. It was written either very close to his return to France, or even after.

The final poem in the first book of the *Poemata* is not an elegy at all, but a hexametrical eclogue entitled *Votum Rusticum: Iolas* (“Shepherd’s Prayer: Iolas”). In it he depicts the pastoral lands of Anjou. The sudden shift at the end of the book is jarring, and perhaps intentionally so. I have not undertaken an analysis

---

\(^{424}\) We now know Benacus as the Lago di Garda.

of this poem since, for the sake of continuity, I have confined my study to elegiac poems; it is not because the poem is undeserving of a closer look.426

II. The Elegies

1. The exilic Ovid as ‘nostalgic’ poet

The reading of du Bellay’s poems that follows is informed by a particular way of reading the Tristia and Ex Ponto. This posits an exilic poet Ovid who,427 through his narration of the poems, is concerned with how nostalgia and memory function, and who seeks to create by means of his poetic exploration of longing an aesthetic, inwardly-focused literary homeland for himself, separate from the physical and historical world.428 In writing his poems, Ovid follows the impulse of all exiles in contemplating on his home while lodged in a foreign place; he rewrites the present so as to not have to let go of the past. By indulging in his present miseries, the exilic Ovid can always juxtapose his present situation with an idealized past or future, his current location with an idealized home.429 The effect of this is that every act of poetic expression is transmogrified, like one

426 This poem would serve as a good focus for a reading of du Bellay in relation to Sannazaro and Navagero, whom I mentioned above.
427 To be clear, I should make clear that my discussions focus on the persona of the poet Ovid within the poetry, not the historical Ovid.
428 An excellent exploration of how Ovid’s exile poems have been read in modern Russian poetry, re: nostalgia, can be found in chapters 2 and 5 of Zara Martirisova Torlone, Russia and the Classics: Poetry’s Foreign Muse (London: Duckworth, 2009).
429 I place ‘nostalgic’ in quotes in my title to this section for this reason: one can hardly have true nostalgia for something that never existed, and the objects of Ovid’s longing are often idealized versions of what he has lost.
of his famous metamorphoses, into an act of remembering. This impulse is why there are no poems in the *Tristia*, nor any *Epistulae* from the Black Sea, that show the exile optimistically pushing past his grief and making a new home for himself in Tomis. The exilic Ovid does not want to do either of these things, since he would then lose touch with what it feels like to have lost something; and in his foray into the real world, living as a real man in the real Tomis, would likely cause the imaginary Rome which he had so carefully constructed in his poetry and in his head to crumble into dust.

The Ovid of the exile poems creates his own space for poetic expression by evoking in his audience a belief in his past happiness—it is at the heart of the *Tristia*. The past becomes idealized, mythologized: his distant wife becomes Penelope, he becomes Ulysses. The Ovidian exilic persona remains locked in an eternal present, equidistant from an imaginary past and an unrealizable future. He becomes a living contradiction: a stationary transient, in both space and time, unable to flee his Tomitan prison, unable to escape the permanent winter that

---

430 Compare Aciman on Proust: “The slow solitary metamorphosis of what truly happened into what, after many years, finally emerges in prose [or poetry, in Ovid’s case] is the hallmark of Proust’s labor of love. Proust is at once the most canonical and uncanonical author, the most solemnly classical and the most subversive, the author in whom farce and lyricism, arrogance and humility, beauty and revulsion are indissolubly fused, and whose ultimate contradiction reflects an irreducible fact about all of us: we are driven by the desire to be happy, and if that fails, by the belief that we once have been,” (“Letter from Illiers-Combray” in *False Papers*, 71).

431 The importance of how Ovid presents himself to his audience in the *Tristia* in order to encourage his readers accept a particular belief or feigning as belonging to the poet has been emphasized by Ellen Oliensis, “The Power of Image-Makers: Representation and Revenge in Ovid *Metamorphoses* 6 and *Tristia* 4,” *Classical Antiquity* 23 (2004), 296-319. She has used her exploration of the exilic Ovid’s self-representation to once again open the debate over the historical reality of Ovid’s exile.
holds the Black Sea coast in its icy grip. This space is the realm of the nostalgic, wherein the desire for what was lost becomes greater than the love of that which was lost ever was. This particular version of Ovid could never return to Rome, even if invited; he could never invite his family to join him and make a home in Tomis, if his poetic project is to continue. The name of his poems, the Tristia, makes this clear: the sadness is essential, for, if he gives it up, he must once again live in a real world, which is ultimately bound to disappoint. The way he must avoid this disappointment, then, not to mention future adversities, is to at all costs avoid being content with his lot.

In the Tristia and Ex Ponto, Ovid remains caught in the ceaseless interchange between two locales and two times, like an American motorist trapped in an unfamiliar European roundabout. He begins to feel more and more at home in the circular loop, getting caught up in the traffic himself, and eventually stops trying to make it to his exit. Against all sensible logic, (for who would reasonably consider staying in the loop,) he instead begins to imagine what would happen if he did make it to his exit and ruminates on how exactly he got into the roundabout, and finds these mental and creative acts far

---

432 Aciman, in the story “Pensione Eolo,” from False Papers, calls this traffic ‘palintropic,’ drawing on Heraclitus as his inspiration: “Let me in fact borrow an adjective from Heraclitus to give this traffic of multiple turns and returns a name by calling it palintropic. To quote Diels’s Fragment 51: ‘They do not comprehend how a thing agrees at variance with itself; it is an attunement turning back on itself, like that of the bow and the lyre,’” (139).

433 Yet Ovid’s exilic persona can hardly be held to the standards of normal, rational thinking: one needs only consider the irrationality of the Ovid of the Ibis, presented as evidence of the poet’s depiction of his own total mental collapse by Gareth Williams in The Curse of Exile.
more productive than the prospect of actually proceeding on his way to his destination. He gets caught up in anticipation.

This anticipation bleeds into the rhetoric of Ovid’s poems. The _anthypophora_, a figure of reasoning that one employs by asking and immediately answering one’s own questions, raising and settling _imaginary_ objections, is one of his favorite tools. In fact, the most famous section of the _Tristia_, Book 2, could itself be seen as a sort of book-length _anthypophora_: after all, it begins with a set of questions anticipated by Ovid. The exile poet takes his anticipation one step further: _Tristia_ 2 is, when viewed as a whole, actually a poetic reaction to an anticipated reaction. Everyone familiar with the exile poems knows that in Book 2 Ovid seeks not a restoration to Rome but a milder place to spend his exile. This, however, is problematic. Why does he not simply ask to come home? The first possible answer that arises is that perhaps the poet is making clear that he does not want to come home at all. The second, and much more provocative answer, is that Ovid’s poetry has begun to reflect the _palintropic_ loop in which he is stuck: he anticipates the reaction to his own action, and in turn, reacts to the reaction without ever initiating the original action that he intended to take. Were he to ask Augustus for a return, he anticipates (whether rightly or wrongly) that he would be denied; so, instead, he merely asks for a more moderate exile. This sort of

---

434 The major question laid out at the start of the elegies, the question which presumably the poem is meant to address, is why does Ovid keep writing poetry after all it has done to hurt him (see vv. 1-4).
anticipation can go on indefinitely, forming its own feedback loop, and within this loop the exile poems reside. It is no great wonder, then, that nothing ‘happens’ in them, and that they are all so similar to each other (two common refrains of the poems’ critics). These common criticisms, on the contrary, reflect one of the poems’ greatest achievements: they become a literary work about the exploration of a space, a feeling, and they are not dependent upon plot or ‘things happening’ to produce their artistic effect.

The exilic Ovid’s problem, then, is not so much with Tomis as it is with himself. His writings are nostalgic in that he dwells in the realm of nostalgia. He does not live in Rome, nor does he live in Tomis; rather, he lives suspended between the two, and, in an act to ‘out-Ulysses’ Ulysses, he comes to recognize that his desire for his homeland is not the motivating force he thought. The desire for home, paradoxically, is his home—or perhaps something better than his home; the imaginary is made tangible. Michèle Lowrie has argued that Ovid, in his representation of Roman triumphs in the exile poetry (at Tr. 4.2, Ex P.2.1 and 3.4—which are effectively representations of a represenation), “contrary to his rhetoric of aesthetic failure, his theory of representation compensates for the terrible inability to be there. Reading provides a surrogate presence.”

I would add to this only the obvious statement that the writing of such provides a surrogate place, to which the reader’s surrogate presence may travel. The result

---

of this mindset is the union of poet and poetry in a way that was not possible for Ovid until he took up exile as his topic: his writings become his home; his writing supplants his living.

To see the extent of this phenomenon, one needs only to look at the beginning of the *Tristia* and compare it with the final poem of the *Ex Ponto*. In Tr. 1.1, Ovid is content for his book to stand as surrogate to himself, to represent him and his interests in Rome, and to travel where he is not permitted. Though the book is a stand-in for Ovid, the book is not yet Ovid: there is a hint that an Ovid yet lives outside of his writing. In this opening poem he indulges in creating an imaginary future: he conjures up an image of what will happen when his book reaches Rome—not the real Rome, of course, but rather the one he has rebuilt inside of his head, through which he leads his book on a tour. In contrast, by the end of the *Ex Ponto*, the exilic Ovid is fully a resident within the realm of nostalgia. The piece, which begins as an attack against an unnamed enemy soon morphs into a meandering remembrance of all of the poets among whom he once lived and was read. It is no attack at all, but rather a creation of a past in his imagination: a place where all of his poetic friends can dwell together with him. Ovid the man no longer really exists; there is only his poetry:

\[ et mihi nomen, \]
\[ tum quoque, cum vivis adnumerarer, erat. \]
I had a name as well, actually, when I was numbered among the living.  
(Ex. P. 4.16.3-4)

omnia perdidimus: tantummodo vita relict est  
praebat ut sensum materiamque mali.  
quid iuvat extinctos ferrum dimittere in artus?  
non habet in nobis iam nova plaga locum.

I have lost everything: life now remains solely  
to provide me with the sense and substance of sorrow.  
What is the pleasure in stabbing steel into a dead body?  
For new wounds, in me there is no place.  
(Ex. P. 4.16.49-52)

Ovid’s life is no life; it is materia: the stuff of poetry. Three words of the final verse ring out loud and clear: non habet locum, there is no place.

Ovid’s Tristia and Ex Ponto turn the ancient maxim of Sophocles, expressed by the chorus at the sight of the aged Oedipus, that it is best never to have been born, and next best, to return as soon as possible whence one has come, upon its head. In light of this proverb, to continue searching forever for some illusory and unattainable goal would be the pinnacle of folly. Ovid does just this in the service of his own art, presenting a far more optimistic outlook in his own model of nostalgia. He returns neither to his home, nor does he create a new home, a little piece of Rome on the shores of the Black Sea. He cannot journey back in time to the Rome of his recent past, nor does he endeavor to

---

⁴³⁶ OC 1223-1228.
progress into any sort of meaningful future. He persists on dwelling in the flow between these two times and places in pursuit of an ever-receding, infinitely distant aesthetic ‘homeland’ of longing and desire that defies the limitations of time and space, not to mention Augustus and death. He deftly produces a creative space in which to avoid the inevitable disappointment of his fleeting experience with Rome and the inevitable disappointment with any future attempts at happiness in reality, while avoiding the complete and utter nihilism of Sophocles’ Athenian chorus.

2. Joachim du Bellay

How, therefore, does du Bellay make use of all of this? He too, in his Roman exile—ironic in that it is the very place from which Ovid was banished—exploits this space in which the exilic Ovid made a home for himself as the locus for his own poetic project. His Roman poems (as well as Les Regrets), like the Tristia and Ex Ponto, establish for the poet a home between several worlds, a home that exists nowhere on a map, but rather in the imaginary, in the act of thinking about the past and idealizing the future.

To understand how du Bellay is led to this poetic exploration, we must momentarily return to the contents of La Défence et Illustration de la Langue Francoyse. In it, du Bellay champions the artistic and cultural gifts of the ancient world in true Renaissance fashion. He argues that the cultural achievements that
were distinct to the Romans and Greeks and their respective languages are not impossible to adapt and apply to the French vernacular, despite their separation, both temporal and spatial, from sixteenth-century France. In this application, he claims, the French language will itself be glorified through imitation of the ancients and their artistic forms.

This sentiment reflects an idealization of the ancient world typical of humanists in the Renaissance (and no doubt familiar to many modern classicists). It is a nostalgia for an ancient past which, though gone and out of reach, may be accessed in the imagination and used to embellish the arts, language, and government. It situates the humanist as a cultural exile, separated in time and space from a homeland wherein the roots of all culture were contained.

Upon reading the *Deffence*, one would expect that a trip to Rome would be just what du Bellay desired. Why, therefore, when he gets there, does he write the plaintive poems of exile that make up his Roman elegies? Simply put, when he reaches Rome, the place is too much like the real thing; it is not enough like what it is in his head.\(^{437}\) It is the predictable let-down of any return from exile. This experience of a derealization, like the famous one undergone by Freud upon his trip to the Athenian Acropolis, causes du Bellay to recognize that the *plotting* of the ‘return trip’ is far more enjoyable than the trip itself: the process of

\(^{437}\) Du Bellay begins his exploration from this Petrarchan sentiment, but proceeds with a deeper psychological exploration. One may recall the discussion on pp. 261-2.
inventing ancient Rome is far more productive and liberating than finding it. This is in large part because it is not there to find; du Bellay’s point of arrival can only ever be contemporary Rome, and the physical location can never be enough.

Du Bellay is confronted by the Renaissance’s problematic transformation of the ancient world into a purely intellectual space, and the dissatisfaction that this engenders is the result of his now double exile: not only is he cut off from his home among the fertile orchards of the Loire valley, but his journey to intellectual capital of the world has not gotten him a single step closer to the Rome of Vergil, Horace, and Ovid.

Du Bellay, in an act similar to that of the exilic Ovid before him, ceases trying to use his own humanist nostalgia as a fuel to reach a past that he recognizes is fully lost. He rather takes up the space between the humanist image of the ancient past and his own idealistic vision of a future, culturally-flourishing France as his poetic home, allowing himself to get caught up in the flow of traffic between these various and sometimes contradictory ideas. The Roman Elegies and their exploration of this nostalgic space represent the process of du Bellay undergoing an intellectual and poetical transformation, a process that leads du Bellay to write Les Regrets, the work which best exemplifies the poetry he called for in the Deffence. To be able to write French poetry in imitation of the ancients

438 Freud experienced a fleeting disbelief that the Acropolis truly existed in material reality, which took place as he was, in fact, standing on the Acropolis in 1904. He recorded the event in an open letter to Romain Rollard in 1936, entitled, “A Disturbance of Memory on the Acropolis.”
at such a high level of originality, du Bellay first had to work out for himself what it meant to imitate the ancients; he in fact came to realize that there are no ancients to imitate other than the ones whom we create. The exilic poems of Ovid were integral to du Bellay’s realization of this fact.

2a. Dedication and Elegy 1: Establishing the exilic (and nostalgic) model

Du Bellay’s elegies begin with a dedicatory epigram, addressed to his patron, Marguerite of France, sister to Henry II.

\begin{quote}
Principibus placuisse viris non ultima laus est,
Ut cecinit Latiae gloria prima lyrae.
Ast ego, qui patriis nuper digressus ab oris,
Ausonium tento non bene certus iter,
Hae tibi si placeant incultiæ, Diva, Camoenae,
Crediderim summis me placuisse Deis.\footnote{The Latin texts of du Bellay’s poems come from the edition of Demerson. English translations are my own.}
\end{quote}

There is no greater praise than to have pleased princes, as the first glory of the Latin lyre\footnote{He means Horace (v.1 is a direct quote of Epist. 1.17.35).} has sung. But I, who recently departed from my paternal shores, steered a path towards Ausonia, uncertain: if these uncivilized Muses should please you, Goddess, I would believe that I have pleased the gods in heaven.

This poem was likely written in 1558 before the publication of the Poemata, that is, after du Bellay had returned to France from Rome, (as the expression \textit{nuper digressus} suggests: \textit{nuper} being less recent than, say, an adverb like \textit{modo}). It is
written, then, with the perspective of hindsight, reflecting upon his sojourn abroad. His exile will hang over the entire book of poems, as his second distich makes clear: he was away from home (*patriis...digressus ab oris*, v. 3) and unsure of his poetic efforts in a foreign tongue (*non bene certus*, v.4). This uncertainty toward his poetic product is reminiscent of the estranged Ovid’s frequent assertions that his time in a non-Latinate region has weakened his poetic faculties.\footnote{It also reflects Ovid’s own characterization of himself during the difficulties of his travels (see for example *Tr*. 3.2.15: *terris dubius iactabar et undis* (“I was uncertain as I was tossed about on land and sea’’)). Gareth Williams has written extensively on Ovid’s posture of poetic decline throughout the exile poems; see both *Banished Voices* and *Curse of Exile*.} This expression of doubt in his *ingenium* is also iterated in v. 5, wherein he refers to his collected poems as *incultae Camoenae* (“uncivilized Muses”).

Du Bellay’s depiction of his travels also casts him as a latter-day Aeneas, as he, like the epic hero, seeks the shores of Italy, uncertain of the path and what will happen. The third verse of the epigram clearly echoes the first verse of the *Aeneid* in its ending, *ab oris*. In casting himself in this role, he layers his own poetic persona, like a transparency, on top of Ovid’s exilic persona, which, in turn, Ovid layered over the figure of Aeneas, and through Aeneas, over Odysseus as well. Ovid does this same thing from the start of the *Tristia*, in poem 1.2. This poem may be argued to be the first ‘real’ poem of the collection (since 1.1 stands apart in that it addresses the book itself as a sort of twisted dedicatory epistle), wherein Ovid depicts his sea journey from Rome to Tomis, beginning...
'Di maris et caeli – quid enim nisi vota supersunt? / solvere quassatae parcite membra ratis, / neve, precor, magni subscribite Caesaris irae!' (“Gods of sea and sky—for what remains but to pray?—I beg you, forbear to break apart the body of my shaken ship, and do not subscribe to the wrath of great Caesar!”). With v. 2, Ovid recalls the reaction of Aeneas to the storm at *Aen.* 1.92 (*solvuntur frigore membra*), which in turn recalls Odysseus’ fear of the storm at *Od.* 5.297 (*Ὀδυσσῆος λύτο γούνατα*).442 The eleven lines which follow (vv. 4-14) openly compare Ovid’s sufferings with those of the two epic heroes.

Du Bellay grafts himself onto this chain of exiles both here in the dedication and in Elegy 1 which opens the collection. This creates a palimpsest of exilic voices, by which the lines between present and past (and, to some extent future as well, by way of du Bellay’s uncertainty of the future reception of his poetry at the French court in vv. 5-6,) begin to be blurred, as well as the distinction between myth and reality. Ironically, this act of self-mythologizing is also employed by du Bellay to emphasize the ‘reality’ of his own exilic sufferings by contrasting them with past literary figures (whose own travails were fiction), in the same way that Ovid does in the *Tristia*.443

---

443 Take for example, *Tr.* 1.5.79-80: *adde quod illius pars maxima ficta laborum; / ponitur in nostris fabula nulla malis* (“Furthermore, the greatest part of his [i.e. Odysseus] labors are fiction; in my woes there is nothing made up”). Du Bellay shows similar layering of poetic persona in Sonnet 31 of the *Regrets* (see Tucker, *Homo Viator*, 253-4). I should note here that it seems, at least on the evidence presented by Chamard (*du Bellay*, 361), that where similarities exist between a
Despite the author’s historical travel to Rome, the journey described here (and developed further in Elegy 1) is also a metaphorical journey, a literary creation which symbolizes his exchange of French verse for Latin and represents his overall attitude towards his Latin writings. The commentary of Geneviève Demerson on v. 3 of du Bellay’s epigram provocatively suggests, “cf. notamment Horace, Carm. 4, 15 et Ovide, Met. 15, 176-177,” but does not develop this referral any further. The reference Demerson makes to the Metamorphoses is to the two verses that begin the following passage, which appear in the speech of Pythagoras:

‘Et quoniam magno feror aequore plenaque ventis
vela dedi: nihil est toto, quod perstet, in orbe.
cuncta fluunt, omnisque vagans formatur imago;
ipsa quoque adsiduo labuntur tempora motu,
non secus ac flumen; neque enim consistere flumen
nec levis hora potest: sed ut unda inpellitur unda
urgeturque prior veniente urgetque priorem,
tempora sic fugiunt pariter pariterque sequuntur
et nova sunt semper; nam quod fuit ante, relictum est,
fitque, quod haut fuerat, momentaque cuncta novantur.’

And since I am borne upon a great sea, and to the winds
I give full sail: there is nothing in the whole world which persists.
Everything flows, and all is formed as a fleeting image;
time itself glides, too, in its ceaseless motion,
no different than a river; indeed, neither can a river stand still,
nor the slippery hour: but as wave crashes upon wave

vernacular and a Latin poem, the Latin poem was likely composed first. As Lloyd-Jones (“Du Bellay’s Journey,” 315n2) confirms, “This is in line with all we know of humanist practice.”

444 Œuvres Latines, 223.
and compels the wave before it, as it is compelled by the one to come, time likewise flees and likewise is pursued and is forever new; for what was before is left behind, and what scarcely was comes into being, and every moment is renewed. (Met. 15.176-185)

Demerson’s reference likely arose from du Bellay’s use of both *digressus ab oris* (v.3) and *non bene certus* in (v. 4): the literal reference to his trip to Italy first becomes a metaphor for his literary production that, in turn, in the context of this passage from the *Metamorphoses*, changes into a metaphor for life itself. Professor Demerson’s comment is not at all out of place, and in fact, the suggestion that the above passage should be recalled by du Bellay’s dedicatory epigram is entirely fitting for the reading of du Bellay’s poems which I am offering. Ovid’s Pythagoras channels Heraclitus (his *cuncta fluunt* in v. 178 is a Latin translation of Heraclitus’s maxim πάντα ρεῖ), and depicts the continual displacement of all things; furthermore, Pythagoras’s words are representative of the type of traffic between times and places which I have continued to reference.⁴⁴⁵ It is within this abstract concept of displacement that the exile poems of both Ovid and du Bellay establish their intellectual and aesthetic homes. In this reflection back on his body of Latin work (here placed at the beginning of his collection), du Bellay realizes the eternal present of the exile and that, try as one might, the past is gone and irrecoverable; it exists only in the present moment insofar as we construct it

---

⁴⁴⁵ Recall Aciman’s own use of Heraclitus referenced above (n. 432).
for ourselves in the present through an act of memory, through a feeling of
longing and nostalgia. This citation of Demerson seems somewhat non-
sequitur; it is possible that he sensed in the passage the similarity in sentiment to
which I have pointed, but ultimately his motives must remain a mystery.

In the first elegy of the collection, deceptively entitled “Cur intermissis
Gallicis Latine scribat,” (“Why he writes in Latin, while French is abandoned,”) du
Bellay again takes up the images of seafaring and its dangers.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Gallica cum nostri nunc linquant aequora remi,} & \quad 1 \\
\text{Et Latii tentent alta fluenta maris,} \\
\text{Haud sponte huc nostra est ventis allapsa carina,} \\
\text{O Diva, ingenii portus et aura mei.} \\
\text{...} \\
\text{dum regerent cursus patrii per caerulea ponti,} \\
\text{Nec quateret nostram dira procella ratem,} \\
\text{Tunc licuit plenum securum currere velis,} \\
\text{Tunc mihi nec Scylla aut nota Charybdis erat.} & \quad 10 \\
\text{...} \\
\text{Ast ubi me rapidis alieno sidere ventis,} & \quad 15 \\
\text{Externum puppis detulit in pelagus,} \\
\text{Tunc ego Tyrrhenum praeceps sum raptus in aequor,} \\
\text{Tunc me tristis hyems in vada caeca tulit.}
\end{align*}
\]

\[446\] This, then, turns exile into a metaphor for the human condition. I am reminded of e. e. cummings’s introduction to New Poems (1938): “Take the matter of being born. What does being born mean to mostpeople? Catastrophe unmitigated. Socialrevolution....Mostpeople fancy a
guaranteed birthproof safetysuit of nondestructible selflessness. If mostpeople were to be born
twice they’d improbably call it dying—
you and I are not snobs. We can never be born enough. We are human beings; for whom birth is a
supremely welcome mystery, the mystery of growing: which happens only and whenever we are
faithful to ourselves. You and I wear the dangerous looseness of doom and find it becoming.
Life, for eternal us, is now and now is much to busy being a little more than everything to seem
anything, catastrophic included.”

\[447\] It is deceptive, as Lloyd-Jones (“Du Bellay’s Journey,” 306) points out, because the rest of the
poem “brings no further development of the cur.”
Since now my oars are quit of the Gallic waters,
and they make a trial of the Latin sea’s flowing deep,
to this place, all unwilling, my vessel is driven by the winds,
O goddess, the harbor and fair breeze of my imagination.
...
While I guided my course through the blue of my ancestral sea,
the fearsome storm shook not my craft,
then I was allowed to proceed safely at full sail,
then I had no Scylla, no infamous Charybdis.
...
But once I, in gusty winds, beneath an unknown star,
was borne by my ship into foreign water,
then was I plucked headlong into the Tyrrhenian sea,
the gloomy winter storm then carried me into hidden shoals.
Here there are great stones, and rocks hidden beneath the surface,
here the waves of a monstrous whirlpool terrorize my craft.
Now, in place of Nymphs, immense walls of sea water
confront me; now Auster, swollen with rain, rages.
(El. 1. 1-4, 7-10, 15-22)

Such an opening to the collection proper firmly establishes the exilic poetry of
Ovid as the foremost of du Bellay’s models. The theme of sea travel and its use as
a metaphor for Ovid’s exilic condition is so prevalent throughout the Tristia that
four of the eleven elegies in Book 1 make use of this theme: Ovid employs sea-
storms first in elegy 1.2, then again at 1.4 and 1.11, and, though it lacks a storm
scene, 1.10 also deals with sea travel. Furthermore, du Bellay’s *tristis hyemis* in v. 18 is hardly a subtle allusion.

The poem also recalls Ovid’s exile through its ironic reversal of Ovid’s circumstances: it is Ovid’s native waters which cause du Bellay difficulty. He explicitly emphasizes this at vv. 7-10, followed by vv. 15-19, contrasting the peaceful coastal waters of his native France with the hostility of Italian seas.

Furthermore, the first direct textual allusion employed by du Bellay in the elegies is a reprise of *Ex P. 2. 8. 68*. Du Bellay’s vocative address to Marguerite in v. 4, *ingenii portus et aura mei*, recalls Ovid’s own address to the Caesars, *(vos eritis nostrae portus et ara fugae, “you will be the harbor and the altar of my exile,”)* who come to life in his mind when he views their likenesses on a medallion. Much more than the mere presence of a line from one of Ovid’s exilic poems, the content of this allusion is relevant in two key respects.

First, du Bellay alters the verse in significant ways. He intensifies the nautical imagery of the poem in his vocative aside, replacing Ovid’s *ara* (‘altar’) with *aura* (‘favorable breeze’). He also changes the genitive object of the nominative pair (*portus* and *aura*) from *fugae* to *ingenii*. If du Bellay’s verse is read with the original in mind, this substitution creates a parallel between these two words, an equation of the two terms: exile equals poetic inspiration. This interchange points to a conception of exile that envisions the condition not

---

448 He retains, however, the impact of the Ovidian *ara* by addressing Marguerite *Diva* (‘goddess’).
simply as the subject matter of the poetry (characterized by a word like *materia*), but rather as the well-spring of poetic sentiment (characterized by the use of *ingenium*).

Second, the allusion is drawn from a poem that I would classify among Ovid’s most nostalgic. The pretense for the poem is ostensibly that Ovid has received from his friend Cotta Maximus some sort of metalwork, generally called a medallion, which bears the likenesses of Augustus, Tiberius, and Livia. At the sight of their faces, his mind takes off racing back to Rome (*redii, nec me tenet ultima tellus, / utque prius, media sospes in urbis moror, “I have returned, the edges of the Earth do not hold me, and as before, I linger safely in the city’s heart,” vv.11-12). In the midst of this imagined return to the past (see *utque prius* above), Ovid thereupon envisions a future in which Augustus and Livia grow as old as Nestor and the Cumaean Sibyl, Tiberius will conquer Germany, and, more importantly, they will become favorable to Ovid once more (vv. 39-51). Near the end of this poem, the reader begins to question the reality of this medallion, as it becomes clear that Ovid may be employing the piece of metal as a metaphor for the exile poetry itself. This all important passage comes just before the one alluded to by du Bellay:

*felices illi, qui non simulacra, sed ipsos,*

*qui deveum coram corpora vident.*

---

449 I use this term, of course, in the sense described above.
quod quoniam nobis invidit inutile fatum,
quos dedit ars, vultus effigiemque colo.

Happy are they who see not images, but the very things,
and who see forms of the gods face to face.
Since harmful fate has begrudged me this,
I cultivate the expressions and the likenesses which art allows.

(Ex. P. 2.8.57-60)

Just as the medallion is made up of images of reality crafted by art, so too is the exile poetry; the last verse (v. 60) could just as easily apply to Ovid’s poems as to the carved medallion. Ovid, tellingly, calls those who see things in reality felices (‘happy’); those who must craft their image by art are, therefore, by default, tristes. The domain of images constructed while suspended between two spaces, the home and the not-home, and two times, the imagined past and the imagined future, is the province of ‘the sad ones,’ the exiles.

In the conclusion of this poem, du Bellay makes it explicit that the end of his exile would signal the end of his literary experimentation with the Latin tongue.

Quodsi iterum liceat caelo spectare sereno,
Sidera, quae velis dextra fuere meis,
Tum demum Ausonios fluctus ventosque relinquam,
Et patrii repetam littora nota Sali,
Votaeque, servatus, sacra suspensa tabella
Persolvam templis, Margari Diva, tuis.

The verb Ovid uses here, colo, is often used in the exile poems with the Muses as its object to stand for the writing of poetry. Ovid’s utilization of this verb and the later reception of it is discussed in my chapter on Klemens Janicki.
But if I should again be allowed to look upon a peaceful sky,  
the stars that have favored my sails,  
only then shall I leave behind the wave and wind of Ausonia,  
and seek again the shores of my paternal sea;  
saved, I shall honor my vow by hanging a tablet, hallowed  
to your temple, my divine Marguerite.  
(El. 1.23-28)

Here du Bellay is calling attention to an aspect of the Ovidian exilic muse that I  
pointed out above: as with Ovid, the end of exile would mean the end of  
poetry—or at least this particular type of poetry; here again we have an equation  
of the condition of exile with the inspiration of the Latin Muse. But for du Bellay,  
since he acknowledges his dabbling in exilic poetry as a thought experiment—a  
means to understand his place in what he sees as a continuous literary tradition  
that stretches from antiquity to his present—it is not the end of all poetry (as  
presumably the tabella in v. 27 will contain new French verses for his patroness).  
In these verses we are offered a glimpse of how du Bellay views Ovid’s exilic  
persona almost as a costume that can be donned when one must turn one’s  
thoughts to creating a unique literary space for oneself. Du Bellay’s tabellae are no  
doubt meant to be the votives of a sailor saved from shipwreck.451 Through this  
image, du Bellay recalls the tabula of both Horace (Odes 1.5) and Ovid (Tr. 1.6):

\[
\begin{align*}
  \textit{miseri, quibus} & \hspace{1cm} \textit{intemptata nites: me tabula sacer} \\
  \textit{votiva paries indicat uvida}
\end{align*}
\]

451 For examples see Cicero Nat. Deo. 3.37.89; Juvenal 12.26-8; Horace S. 2.1.33.
Poor wretches, the men
you dazzle, untried: as for me, the consecrated
votive tablet on the wall displays
to the mighty god of the sea
my hanging, dripping clothes.

(Horace, Odes 1.5.13-16)

tu facis, ut spolium non sim, nec nuder ab illis,
nafragii tabulas qui petiere mei.

You [Ovid’s wife] make it so I am not despoiled, not stripped by those
who make for the planks of my wrecked ship.

(Ovid, Tr. 1.6.6-7)

Horace’s metaphorical votive tablets stand as a monument to his amatory
shipwreck with the coquettish Pyrrha. The Ovid of the Tristia will be lucky to just
to make it to the temple to hang one of his shattered tabulae as an offering; in a
reversal of the Horatian image, it is only through a faithful woman’s intervention
(i.e. his loyal wife’s) that Ovid is preserved at all. Ovid’s image in effect taunts
Horace for not having suffered any real misfortune. With this connection
between his poetic predecessors established, du Bellay’s gesture to Ovid,
gesturing back to Horace might be viewed as a mocking of Ovid: du Bellay can

Similarly, see Ibis v.18.
take off the exile’s robes and return home; for him, exile can be a literary game, and his votives are permitted to be as trite and metaphorical as Horace’s were.454

2b. Elegy 2: The description (and debunking) of Rome

The second elegy of du Bellay’s Roman collection is entitled Romae Descriptio, and was written at the beginning of the poet’s stay in Rome, sometime in 1553. Though the elegy comes second in the collection, it is written to appear as though it is his debut in writing Latin poetry: near the end of the poem, he writes, “[Sit mhi fas] Hactenus et nostris incognita carmina Musis / Dicere, et insolito plectra movere sono (“[Let it be proper for me] to utter songs hitherto unknown to my Muses, and to stir my plectrum to an unafamiliar sound,” vv. 141-2).455

This poem, on its surface, is a poetic exploration of the monuments and marvels of the eternal city containing ekphrases of varying qualities and dimensions, clearly meant to play on the well-worked, multifarious ‘genre’ of traveller’s guidebooks to the ancient city prevalent throughout 16th-century Europe.456 Though the elegy accomplishes with some degree of success the purpose advanced in its title, an abrupt reversal takes place in the last fifth of the poem. A sudden shift in tone suggests that the first and largest portion of the poem is written from the idealized perspective, typical of the humanists of du

454 Here I am indebted to Tom Hawkins, per sermonem.  
455 See Demerson, Oeuvres Latines, 225.  
456 On this particular phenomenon, the foundational study is Ludwig Schudt, Le guide di Roma, (Vienna: B. Filser, 1930).
Bellay’s era, which presents ancient Rome as living and coexisting simultaneously with the contemporary. Most importantly, this shift is inaugurated by du Bellay’s explicit use of an Ovidian trope common to the exile poems, and what follows represents du Bellay’s exilic critique of the bland humanist idealization that preceded it.

This negative reading of the poem, that it represents disillusionment with Rome itself, is contrary to the view of Helgerson, who sees the elegy, on the whole, as a positive depiction of a Rome which lives despite its age and neglect. He glosses over the abrupt shift in tone and vocabulary, saying only, “Though he eventually moves on to an Antiquities-like meditation on the ruin of Rome and the continuing power of ancient Roman poetry, the Rome he describes seems anything but dead.” 457 This view focuses too much attention on the first part of the poem, and not enough on the last. The debate over just how to read du Bellay’s attitude towards Rome has been an active one, with most of its attention focused on his Antiquities of Rome, using only smalls quotations from the Latin elegies as supplementary evidence.458

457 Joachim du Bellay, 24-5. Furthermore, a similar technique of sudden reversal is also evident in Sonnet 32 of the Regrets, a poem on the same topic, namely the poet’s disillusionment at being in Rome (see Tucker, Homo Viator, 242).
458 An excellent summation of this debate is found in Margaret M. McGowan, The Vision of Rome in Late Renaissance France (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000), 187-188. For the more positive reading of this work see chapter 11 on du Bellay’s Antiquities in Thomas Greene, The Light in Troy: Imitation and Discovery in Renaissance Poetry (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986); a view largely supportive of Greene’s reading, but with hints of skepticism, can be found in Eric McPhail, The Voyage to Rome in French Renaissance Literature (Stanford: Stanford French and
Du Bellay begins his elegy with a *recusatio*; he rejects not a particular theme for his poetry, but rather different occupations in favor of the work of the poet.\(^{459}\)

\[
\begin{align*}
  \textit{Non mea sollicitet saevus praecordia Mavors, } & \quad 1 \\
  \textit{Nec rabies litis, durave iactet hyems. } & \\
  \textit{Nec cupiam insanos Aulae perferre labores, } & \quad 4 \\
  \textit{Sed cingant nostras laurea serta comas. } & \\
  \textit{Nunc iuvat aerii sacro de vertice Pindi, } & \quad 5 \\
  \textit{ducere virgineos per iuga celsa choros. } & \\
  \textit{Nunc iuvat umbrosis lentum iacuisse sub antris, } & \quad 9 \\
  \textit{Et longum plectro concinuisse melos, } & \\
  \textit{Seu libuit molles flammas foelicis Olivae } & \quad 10 \\
  \textit{Hetruscae ad numeros personuisse lyrae, } & \\
  \textit{Seu potius magni laudes contexere Regis, } & \\
  \textit{Dicere vel laudes, Margari Diva, tuas, } & \\
  \textit{Vel qui nunc Romae, Bellaiae gloria gentis, } & \\
  \textit{Purpureum magnus tollit ad astra caput. } & 
\end{align*}
\]

Let not savage Mars trouble my breast, 
    nor the madness of the courts; let not the harsh storm disturb it. 
Let me not desire to endure the maddened labors of the royal hall, 
    rather let laurel garlands wreath my hair. 
Now let it delight me to draw down from the sacred height of airy Pindus 
    virginal choruses and lead them through the lofty ridges. 
Now let it delight me to have lain down, languid, beneath a shady grotto, 
    and to have sung a long song, accompanied by my plectrum, 
either, as it pleases me, of the supple flames of the fruitful Olive, 
    singing to the strains of the Tuscan lyre, 
or rather embroidering the praises of our great king, 
or to offer praise to you, divine Marguerite,

\(^{459}\) This is not to say, however, that the occupations could not in themselves stand as representatives for certain poetic themes.
or of the glory of the family du Bellay, who now at Rome
lifts his great scarlet-clad head to the stars.
(El. 2.1-14)

It is suspicious, particularly in light of the elegy which preceded it, that du Bellay begins by wishing away the harsh effects of the storm (*hyems*, v. 2), as this term (modified as it was by the adjective *tristis* at 1.18) was important in establishing the exilic Ovid as a poetic model for the collection in the previous poem. This however, is more than just a rejection of sea-faring as an occupation. In rejecting sea voyage and warding off winter storms, du Bellay presents the reader with a suspension of the exilic mode that would have been assumed to carry over from the previous poem. It is a marker that du Bellay is here shifting into a poetic voice that is discontinuous with what has immediately preceded it. This shift in poetic mode is also corroborated by the fact that du Bellay recalls his previous poetic work, *L’Olive* — a collection of French sonnets modeled on the vernacular poems of Petrarch, the godfather of traditional Renaissance humanism — which lays outside of the Latin *oeuvre* that the Roman poems sought to explore in the first elegy.460

Furthermore, Demerson signals that v. 4 recalls *Tr*. 4.2.51: *tempora Phoebea lauro cingetur* (“Heads will be wreathed with Apollo’s laurel”).461 The verbal echo is clear enough, and if indeed du Bellay meant to recall this line to his readers, it

460 Note du Bellay’s use of the non-Roman vocabulary *Hetruscae* (“Tuscan,” v. 10), which calls to mind the vernacular poets Petrarch and Dante.

was due to the context of the Ovidian poem whence it was drawn. In *Tr. 4. 2*, Ovid produces a long and spectacular description of the triumph for Tiberius after his defeat of the Germans; this poem, however, is not a record of an actual event, but written in anticipation of the actual event’s possible future occurrence. To add a further layer of complexity to the matter, even if it were to happen, Ovid would never see it, since he is halfway across the world in Tomis. So, in sum, the poem is a flight of fancy, a ‘nostalgic’ piece, in as much one can be nostalgic for an event which has never happened. This is all made clear in a distich (vv. 4.2.57-8) which follows the section in which the citation of Ovid made by du Bellay appears: *haec ego summotus qua possum mente videbo: / erepti ius nobis habet illa loci* (“I, at a remove, will see all this in my mind’s eye, as I am able; for my mind has the right to view places which are snatched from me”). This reference raises further suspicions about the ‘reality’ of what du Bellay writes in his description of Rome. Du Bellay signals through his Ovidian reference that he is about to indulge in a flight of fancy, the recollection of a world which does not exist for him, and perhaps never did exist; it is a humanist idealization of Rome. It is telling that there are no further verbal echoes of the *Tristia* until du Bellay reaches the turning point of the poem that I have mentioned previously.

The poem continues:

*Ilium auspiciis duras superavimus Alpeis,*

*Et pulchrae campos vidimus Hesperiae.*

*Vidimus et flavi contortas Tybridis undas,*

297
Under his\textsuperscript{462} auspices, I surmounted the harsh Alps
and saw the plains of beautiful Hesperia.
I saw too the twisting waves of the golden Tiber,
and the walls of the Romans scattered about the plains;
walls which, though scattered here and there, overthrown in great ruins,
still imperious, exhale their ancient threats.
I have seen the one who holds the keys to lofty Olympus,
Augustus in the miter, and the scarlet-clad fathers.
Why should I mention the hovering towers of great Peter?
No work more beautiful that it exists in Ausonia.
Why should I recall its golden panels and painted ceilings,
and the high lintels in the Popes’ porticoes?
Add to these so many august temples, so many long atria,
and that villa that is by its name beautiful to the eye.\textsuperscript{463}
Add to these so many lofty citadels, and the mass of the Tomb,\textsuperscript{464}
and the golden houses, and painted temples of the gods.

\textsuperscript{462} His cousin, the Cardinal Jean du Bellay.
\textsuperscript{463} The Villa Belvedere.
\textsuperscript{464} Presumably he means the mausoleum of Hadrian, the Castel Sant’Angelo.
The geographical conceits which begin this section run counter to the image of du Bellay’s journey into exile presented in the first poem. Here du Bellay depicts himself as crossing the Alps—that is, making a land journey from France into Italy; this is further emphasized by his mention of the rushing Tiber, which would be the first contact that a foot traveler from France would have with the Roman world. The preferred (metaphorical) mode of transportation for the exile is sea travel, aboard a ship in a storm, not a stroll through the fields of central Italy. The exilic du Bellay has either shifted out of the exilic mode, or is presenting an imaginary journey, just as Ovid journeys back to Rome in *Tr.* 4.2, and other poems throughout the exilic corpus.

Moreover, du Bellay offers his descriptions in bland and repetitive vocabulary, with little that is of stylistic interest. One notes his overuse of the verb *vidimus* (vv. 17, 18, 21) and the expression *adde tot* (vv. 27, 29). The banality of his descriptive vocabulary gives the impression that du Bellay is not describing these things from his own experience but rather from some collective, cultural characterization of how Rome is supposed to look. When he crosses the Tiber, effectively the marker of entrance into the Roman world, things turn gold (like the Tiber itself, see *flavi* at v. 17), become imperious (*imperiosa*, v. 20) and

---

465 Demerson (*Oeuvres Latines*, 226) notes that this is similar to Vergil’s vocabulary as he recounts Italy’s wonders at *G.* 2.150 (*adde*) and 2.161 (*an memorem*). To tie this back to the exilic poetry, consider the arguments made by Rita degli’Innocenti Pierini, *Tra Ovidio e Seneca* (Bologna: Pàtron, 1990), who claims that Ovid’s depiction of Tomis is a clear inversion Vergil’s *Laudes Italiae* (*G.* 2.136-175). We may here be seeing a reversal of the reversal as du Bellay briefly takes up a ‘non-exilic’ viewpoint before critiquing it with his exilic persona.
inanimate objects breathe as though living (*spirant*, v. 20); the sights are described with platitudes: places are ‘beautiful’ (*pulchrae*, v. 16; *pulchrius*, v. 24; *pulchra*, v. 28) and decorated (*pictis*, v. 25; *picta*, v. 30). It is also as though the Classical age of Rome never ended: Augustus, here as the Pope, still reigns, supported by his senate of Cardinals (*Augustum...Patres*, v. 22), displaying in true humanist fashion a continuum between the past and present, as though to cross into Rome is to travel through time.

Even the term that du Bellay uses for Italy, *Hesperia* (v. 16), is suggestive of an imaginary construction: Hesperia is more than the peninsula; it is the western Promised Land sought out by the wandering Aeneas. This banality of description produces a universal and idealized effect, and does not necessarily represent du Bellay’s own exilic perceptions, which come in the latter part of the poem.

And thus the poem continues, making mention of what one would expect: Rome’s bridges (vv. 31-2), the Pantheon (vv. 33-4), its marble fountains (vv. 35-6). After a brief discussion of Rome’s well-known character traits (vv. 39-54), there intrudes a set piece description of the arrival of Cupid among the dancing crowds of Rome. Since desire is a key element of nostalgia (as we shall see below, both du Bellay and Ovid use the term *desiderium* to describe the feeling), and because the element of desire in nostalgia can distort how its object is

---

466 Recall du Bellay’s own self-position with regards to Aeneas in the dedicatory epigram.
remembered, it is worthwhile to examine the way in which du Bellay depicts this deity.

Conveyed in his litter, Cupid arrives with his pretty mother, the resonant ivory thrums to the pointed quill. A gemmed tiara wreathes his marbled brow, and his lips blush red with the tinge of deceptive murex. Golden chains dangle on his milk-white neck, and flashy jewels adorn each snowy hand. Pearls hang from his earlobes, and his twisted locks draw thousand to bend their necks to his sweet yoke. A golden ruche trims his Tyrian blouse, and a long gown flows down to his soft feet. He advances, swinging his footsteps forward with tragic artifice, with artifice he watches; with artifice he flashes his rings.  

(El. 2.55-66)

There is a distinct element of humor in du Bellay’s depiction of the boy-god in drag, but this portrait of Desire offers more than laughs. First, it continues the idealized picture of Rome that the previous sections of the poem have
endeavored to paint; here Cupid is shown as the very stereotype of Roman beauty, milk-white skinned and opulently dressed. But it is the artifice and deceptiveness of this particular Cupid that ought to draw one’s attention. Everything about him is false: his complexion and ruby-red lips are the result of make-up, he wears the costume of a queenly Roman matron, his jewels are meant to distract and dazzle, and most importantly, he parades about like an actor.

It is this particular incarnation of desire, superficial and deceptive, which might lead one to write the trite poetry which preceded this section. This false desire and attraction leads multitudes to the belief that ancient Rome still exists to be experienced by a direct engagement with its relics, rather than recognizing that it is only experienced indirectly through an imaginary construct, created by those who long for it. It ultimately leads to the vacantly imitative Latin poetry which du Bellay criticizes in the Defense and has written in the first part of this elegy. This desire is meant to stand in contrast to du Bellay’s own form of desire that shines through in the latter part of this poem; it is the patriae desiderium (‘desire for the homeland’) that serves as the impetus for his own Muse and forms the core of his exilic elegies. Patriae desiderium even features as the subject

---

467 Note also the vague adjective pulchra (v. 55) used to describe Venus.
of the seventh poem in the collection. This is integral to the poetic paradigm shift that du Bellay is seeking to enact.468

The turning point of the poem comes at vv. 105-6, following a long series of brief descriptions of Rome’s statuary.469 du Bellay shifts out of his idealization and begins his critique of the view of Rome presented within it.

\begin{quote}
Sed quid caeruleos tento percurrere fluctus, 105 
Nocturnasque volo connumerare faceis? 
Singula si cupiam brevibus describere chartis, 
Scribentem calamus destituatque dies. 
Ardua pyramidum dicam, truncosque Colossos, 
Maestaque nunc vacuo muta theatra sinu? 110 
Aspice ut has moleis, quondamque minantia Divis 
Moenia luxurians herba situsque tegant. 
Hic, ubi praeruptis nutantia culmina saxis, 
Descendunt caelo, maxima Roma fuit.
\end{quote}

But why do I try to survey each ocean wave, 
why do I want to count the nighttime stars? 
If I were to desire to describe each and every thing on a few sheets, 
my quill would fail in the writing, and the daylight too. 
Should I speak of the steep slopes of pyramids, maimed colossi, 
squalid theaters, now silent, their curving benches emptied? 
Behold these heaped mounds, once walls that threatened the gods, 
now growing green with grass and long disuse. 
Here where the summits bow low, their stones broken away, 
and fall from heaven, Rome was supreme. 

(El. 2. 105-114)

468 Here du Bellay may be picking up on one of the themes of the Tristia and Ex Ponto upon which I focused in the previous chapter, namely Ovid’s critique and redefinition of cultus, here in its lowest and most superficial form, gaudy dress and make-up.

469 It is also telling that du Bellay follows his set piece on Cupid with a catalogue of statuary. The language that du Bellay uses to describe Cupid leaves one with the impression that he is describing a decorated statue (see ebur (v. 56), marmoream (v. 57), lacteolo (v. 59), niveas (v. 60)) — this incarnation of Desire is just a monument, a relic like any of the others in his long list.
The transition takes place with a trope that is common in the *Tristia* and *Ex Ponto*: a rhetorical expression of *adynata* (‘impossibilities’), in which an impossibility of a contingency is compared to an impossibility of nature.\footnote{On Ovid’s use of this particular trope in the exile poetry, see Claassen, *Displaced Persons*, 231-2.} Du Bellay’s choice of natural phenomena here coincides with one of Ovid’s from *Tr. *1.5.47:

\begin{verbatim}
scire meos casus siquis desiderat omnes,
   plus, quam quod fieri res sinit, ille petit.
tot mala sum passus, quot in aethere sidera lucent
\end{verbatim}

If someone wants to know all of my misfortunes,
   he seeks at something more than my case will allow.
The evils I have suffered number as many as the stars that shine in the ether.

\begin{verbatim}(Tr. *1.5.45-7)\end{verbatim}

Though du Bellay does not verbally echo the line, his metaphorical expression, using ‘torches’ (*faceis*, v. 106) recalls Ovid’s use of the verb *lucere* (‘to shine’). Du Bellay’s additional expression referencing the innumerability of the waves (v. 105) draws the reader immediately back to the first elegy of the collection, as we are reminded of the nautical metaphor for the exile’s condition. In du Bellay’s expression of *adynata*, he parallels the marvels of his idealized Rome to the exiled Ovid’s countless sufferings, at the very moment that du Bellay’s derealization occurs. No longer are things so shiny: Rome’s architecture is grime-covered (*maesta*, v. 110) and the victim of neglect (*situs*, v. 112). Absent are the banal platitudes of the earlier sections of the poem; du Bellay’s language here is less
stereotypical, less trite, and returns to the lyricism of the previous elegy. He caps this section with a cutting critique, couched in the words of Propertius’ best effort at patriotism (*maxima Roma est*, 4.1.1). The simple alteration of tense, du Bellay’s *fuit* from Propertius’ *est*, drives the nail into Rome’s metaphorical coffin.

This close of the poem reinforces just how very lost the Rome of the past is. It also speaks to du Bellay’s conception of the relationship of contemporary literature to Rome.

*Heu tantum imperium, terrisque undisque superbum,*
  *Et ferro et flamma corruit in cineres.*
*Quaeque fuit quondam summis Urbs aemulis Divis,*
  *Barbarico potuit subdere colla iugo.*
*Orbis praeda fuit, totum quae exhauserat orbem,*
  *Quaeque Urbis fuerant, nunc habet Orbis opes.*
*Caetera tempus edax longis tegit obruta seclis,*
  *Ipsaque nunc tumulus mortua Roma sui est.*
*Disce hinc humanis quae sit fiducia rebus:*
  *Hic tanti cursus tam brevis imperii.*

*Salmate o cineres, sancti salvete Poetae,*
  *Quos numerat vates inclyta Roma suos.*
*Sit mihi fas, Gallo, vestros recludere fonteis,*
  *dum caeli Genio liberiore fruor,*
*Hactenus et nostris incognita carmina Musis*
  *Dicere, et insolito plectra movere sono.*
*Hoc mihi cum patriis Latiae indulgete Camoenae,*
  *Alteraque ingenii sit seges ista mei.*
*Forte etiam vivent nostri monumenta laboris,*
  *Caetera cum domino sunt peritura suo.*

Alas, so great an empire, haughty on land and sea, driven to ruin and ashes by sword and flame,
that city, once the rival of the gods on high,
  was made to place its neck beneath a barbarian yoke.
It was the world’s prey, where it once preyed upon the whole world:
  what the city had now is the world’s wealth.
Time, the devourer, has covered the remaining ruins with long centuries,
  Rome herself, dead, is now her own tomb.
Learn here what faith should be entrusted to worldly things:
  here is so short a span for so great an empire.

Hail, you ashes; hail you reverend poets,
  whom Rome the renowned counted among her prophets!
May it be proper for me, a Gaul, to lay open your wellsprings,
  while I profit by the more fertile genius of your sky,
and to utter songs as yet unknown to my Muses,
  and stir my plectrum to an unfamiliar sound.
O Latin Muses, grant this to me, and likewise to my country’s Muses,
  Let this become the harvest my poetic talents reap,
Perhaps this monument of my labor will yet live,
  while the rest are consigned to die with their author.
(El. 2. 123-132, 137-146)

Though the barbarians he depicts refer to the historical invasions and sacks
endured by Rome, they can just as easily refer to armies of contemporary
humanists, come from traditionally barbarian reaches of the former empire to the
capital to attempt to steal something of its literary genius. In fact, du Bellay hints
at this metaphor in his characterization of himself as a ‘Gaul’ (v. 139); no mere
interloper, he is of the race of one of Rome’s ancestral enemies. This
characterization of himself as barbarian plunderer, one may recall, is consistent
with du Bellay’s (more optimistic) exhortation at the end of the Deffence:
“marchez couraigeusement vers cete superbe cite romaine: et des serves
despouilles d’elle...ornez vos temples et autelz” (“March courageously on that proud Roman city and from her captured spoils...adorn your temples and altars”). Du Bellay’s exploitation—for that is the right word—of Roman remains was to be energetic (brutal even), as he likened the process to plunder, stripping bare, and to rapine.” The Latin elegies make clear du Bellay’s metaphorical meaning through their depiction of a Rome that has very little left to steal. It should be apparent by now that to du Bellay Rome as a place is entirely unimportant; it is worth far more to his poetic project as an idea, hence du Bellay’s homage to Rome’s famous poets; they are the remains that he intends to plunder. This deemphasis of Rome’s physical remains therefore, points towards a poetics that is less iterative, more creative: the poets cannot be taken up and transplanted in the same way that a stone monument can.

Ultimately, du Bellay’s imagined Rome crumbles before the reader’s eyes. Instead of a city of glittering monuments, we are presented with a filthy ruin. The rose-tinted glasses through which du Bellay’s literary contemporaries have viewed the ancient world are snatched away. The words of Hugo Tucker (in this case from his discussion of Sonnet 3 of du Bellay’s Les Antiquités de Rome) quite eloquently sum up du Bellay’s critique of traditional humanist hubris, in its belief that ancient Rome could be recaptured in Rome, and do so in a manner that also fits Elegy 2 of the Poemata:

471 Text and translation are from Helgerson, Joachim du Bellay, 412-13.
472 McGowan, Vision of Rome, 188.
[Du Bellay’s response is to produce] a double Rome—disfigured yet alone able to resemble itself, divided against itself historically and architecturally yet one and the same, ostensibly resisting Time’s tooth (at least in part) yet ever flowing with Time’s flux, superficially recognisable by its name and its river yet essentially unknowable and ungraspable like identity itself, or like any moment of being lost in Heraclitus’s (and later Ovid’s) changing River of Time, which is ever consuming and ever consummating...but never still.473

Simple idealization of a longed-for past will not serve du Bellay in his mission to create a place for himself in the literary tradition. Through his adoption of the Ovidian exilic persona, he strips away simplistic nostalgia that is rooted in real measures of time, and in real, physical distances. In doing so, a void is created, and it is in this void that du Bellay establishes himself as the cultivator of a new poetics which recognizes illusiveness of the past and future, and is predicated on a model of poetic desiderium first provided in the Tristia and Ex Ponto. The final couplets of the poem suggest an entirely new poetic enterprise, coming as a result of his experiments with Latin poetry, that is placed in direct contrast with the lost physical monuments of Rome (see monumenta, v. 145).

2c. Elegy 7: Patriae desiderium and the vocabulary of dwelling in nostalgic space

The seventh elegy in the Poemata is by far the most Ovidian work in the entire collection both in style and allusion to the ancient poet’s exilic corpus.

473 Homo Viator, 251.
It depicts exactly what its title states: patriae desiderium, ‘longing for his homeland’ and represents the zenith (in his Latin works at least) of du Bellay’s disillusionment with the city of Rome. In this seventy-eight-line poem, he becomes fully a resident of the aesthetic ‘nostalgic’ space created by Ovid in the exile poems, and continues to reshape its borders to his own purposes, preparing his own artistic patria. Though physically in Rome, he becomes an inhabitant of a country of the imagination.

Du Bellay would not, of course, have known the term ‘nostalgia’ as such. The term that du Bellay uses in his title to capture the essence of his feeling, desiderium, is itself taken up from the exilic Ovidian vocabulary with little alteration. It is drawn from Tr. 3.2:

\[
\begin{align*}
Roma \ domusque \ subit \ desideriumque \ locorum, \\
quicquid \ et \ amissa \ restat \ in \ urbe \ mei. \\
i \ mihi, \ quod \ totiens \ nostri \ pulsata \ sepulcri \\
ianua, \ sed \ nullo \ tempore \ aperta \ fuit! \\
\end{align*}
\]

Rome and my house steal in, the longing for places, and whatever part of myself that remains in my lost city. Alas for me, that so many times I have struck my sepulcher’s door, but at no time did it open!

(Tr. 3.2.21-4)

474 A similar theme can, of course, be found in the Regrets and Antiquities of Rome. A poem greatly similar in sentiment to Elegy 7 is Regrets 31, one of the collection’s most well-known.

475 Demerson (Oeuvres Latines, 245) dates its composition to the second half of 1556, using as evidence the temporal reference in vv. 13-15.

476 For the birth of this term in popular parlance, we can point to the dissertation of the Swiss doctor Johan J. Harder, Dissertatio medica de nostalgia, oder Heimwehe (Basel: 1688).
This poem of Ovid is a summation of the exilic condition as it has been presented in the previous two books, and thereby a thesaurus of the turns and tropes of writing in the realm of the exilic: habitation in a far-off land (vv. 3.2.1-4); the perils of travel, largely by sea (v. 3.2.7); seemingly perpetual winter weather (v. 3.2.8);\(^{477}\) the endurance of extremes ill-suited to the narrator’s ‘softness’ (vv. 3.2.10-14). The difficulty arises for the exilic poet when these initial hardships, which serve as a distraction that lessens one’s heart-sickness, are gone, and only living remains (vv. 3.2.15-16).\(^{478}\)

In *Tr. 3.2*, the exile is confronted with a choice: either make a new life in exile or die. Necessarily either of these actions would result in the end of the exilic poetic project, as there would either be nothing to write about or no one to write it. But it is Ovid who in the *Tristia* posits a third way of living that takes ‘making a new life’ to a creative extreme—a solution that allows for the continuation of his poetic composition. This third option, the construction of an aesthetic *patria* in the imagination, a liminal space that exists between true life and true death,\(^{479}\) and which transcends Tomis without depending upon the physical experience of Rome, is represented in the four-lines excerpted above.

\(^{477}\) In fact, the only seasonal change that is mentioned in *Tr. 3.2* is metaphorical: the tears which flow from Ovid are no less than the mighty torrent produced by the thawing of the snows in springtime (vv. 19-20). The land of exile, of course, remains gripped by frost.

\(^{478}\) *dum tamen et terris dubius iactabar et undis, / fallebat curas aegraque corda labor* (“Nevertheless, while I was battered about, uncertain, on land and sea, the hardship deceived my worry and my sick heart”).

\(^{479}\) Such a space is depicted literally in *Tr. 3.2.23*, as the poet stands before the door of his own crypt, banging for entry.
The exile’s pleas for death cannot be sincere, or cannot be taken as sincere, since we are aware that he always has open to him the respectable Roman option of suicide, which he never chooses. It is with reference to all of this that du Bellay’s choice of title and terminology must be understood.

Referencing Ovid with the title itself was not enough for du Bellay. Elegy 7 is replete with allusions to both the *Tristia* and *Ex Ponto*. These two works provide du Bellay with the vocabulary he requires to express himself fully in the exilic mode. This assumption of vocabulary serves to mark out du Bellay as a full citizen of the aesthetic *patria* as established by Ovid. In light of all of the attention that du Bellay draws to his adoption of Latin for the *Poemata* in the earlier elegies,\(^{480}\) such a high volume of borrowing of Ovid’s exilic language cannot go unnoticed. Just as du Bellay linguistically adapts to his new surroundings in Rome by writing in the Latin tongue, almost against his will (itself a reflection of Ovid in exile),\(^{481}\) so too must he adapt his language to his new, particularly Ovidian country. If he is to dwell in the no-man’s-land of the exilic imaginary, he must adapt to the native language accordingly. In executing his two-layered linguistic shift, du Bellay even outdoes his exilic forbear’s unsubstantiated claims to have learned the Pontic language.

\(^{480}\) Specifically the dedication, Elegy 1, and Elegy 6, which is address to fellow Pléiade member Pierre Ronsard.
\(^{481}\) Once again, see Hinds, “Black Sea Latin.”
Elegy 7 begins with an echo of the Ovidian threat issued against an
unnamed enemy at the outset of Tr. 3.11:

Quicunque ignotis lentus terit ocia terris,
     
Et vagus externo quaerit in orbe domum,
Quem non dulcis amor, quem non revocare parentes,
     
Nec potuit si quid dulcius esse potest,
Ferreus est, dignusque olim cui matris ab alvo
     
Hyrcanae tigres ubera prabuerint.

Whosoever senselessly spends his leisure in unknown lands,
and as a wanderer seeks a home in a foreign realm,
whom no sweet love, no parents could recall,
nor anything sweeter (if that can exist),
is a man of iron, fit, once he was born from his mother’s womb,
for Hyrcanian tigers to have suckled.

(El. 7.1-6)

Si quis es, insoltes qui casibus, improbe, nostris,
     
meque reum dempto fine cruentus agas,
natus es e scopulis et pastus lacte ferino,
     
et dicam silices pectus habere tuum.

If you are he, you shameless man, who mocks my downfall,
who endlessly indicts me, thirsty for my blood,
you were born from rocks, and fed on the milk of a beast,
and I will say you have a heart of stone.

(Tr. 3.11.1-4)

Du Bellay’s reprise is not a targeted attack like that of Ovid; his is a general
indictment of the happy traveler and a rejection of living abroad. He
demonstrates a clear answer to the choice of the exile which I posed above: to
him, the man who can make a new home in a foreign land is no man at all, but
akin to a beast with a heart of stone. And he is no such person, as he states in the
verses which follow: *Non mihi saxea sunt durove rigentia ferro / Pectora, nec tigris,
nec fuit ursa parens* (“My heart is not stone, nor stiffened with harsh iron; neither
was a tiger, nor a bear my parent,” El. 7.7-8). Satisfaction with Rome is not an
option.

Near the beginning of this poem, too, du Bellay returns to the topic of his
change in language:

```plaintext
Annua ter rapidi circum acta est orbita Solis,
Ex quo tam longas cogor inire vias,
Ignitisque procul peregrinus degere tectis,
Et Lyrii tantum vix meminisse mei,
Atque alios ritus, alienos ediscere mores,
Fingere et insolito verba aliena sono.
```

Thrice the yearly orbit of the rapid sun has made its way round,
since I was forced to walk on roads so long,
a foreigner made to bide his time far off in unfamiliar halls,
and only with difficulty do I remember my Loire,
forced to acquaint myself with foreign rites and customs,
and to fashion foreign words with foreign sounds.

(El. 7.14-18)

The most important feature of this passage is not that du Bellay yet again
mentions his use of Latin, but rather that he does so while using Ovidian forms
of expression. The figure with which du Bellay dates his composition, reference

---

482 This particular construction, with a pentameter line ending in *meminisse* and a genitive
personal pronoun, belongs stylistically to the *Tristia* and *Ex Ponto*. See *Tr*. 4.4.40; 5.13.18; *Ex P*. 2.4.6; 2.11.4; 3.6.11; 4.4.10; 4.6.50.
483 This is reminiscent of Ovid’s feigning to forget Latin at *Tr*. 5.12.57.
to successive orbits of the sun, is found in a similar formula at the beginning of
Tr. 4.7: *Bis me sol adiit gelidae post frigora brumae* (“Twice has the sun approached
me after the cold of frosty winter”).

Du Bellay’s use of the word *peregrinus* (“foreigner”) in reference to himself
stands out. One might expect that such an adjective would appear commonly in
Ovid’s exile works, but this is not the case. It appears only four times in the
*Tristia* and once in the *Ex Ponto*. Only in one of these instances is it used as a
substantive and in the nominative case, Tr. 1.1.59, presented here with its
context:

\[
\begin{align*}
  &\text{nec te, quod venias magnam peregrinus in Vrbem,} \\
  &\text{ignotum populo posse venire puta.} \\
  &\text{ut titulo careas, ipso noscere colore;} \\
  &\text{dissimulare velis, te liquet esse meum.}
\end{align*}
\]

Do not, since you should come into the great city as a foreigner,
think that you will be able to go unrecognized by the people.
Though you lack a title, they will know you by your color;
though you should wish to hide, it is clear that you are mine.

*(Tr. 1.1.59-62)*

Du Bellay applies to himself the same term that Ovid applied to his *book*, and
thereby he has begun to reflect the poetic product of Ovid’s exile. Keep in
mind, too, that Ovid speaks to his books as though they are his offspring and

---

484 Tr. 1.1.59 (*peregrinus*); 2.1.421 (*peregrinis...armis*); 3.1.61 (*peregrinis...columnis*); 4.8.25
(*peregrinum...caelum*). *Ex P.* 1.1.3 (*peregrinos...libellos*). Ovid in fact uses the adjective more often in
the *Heroides* and far more often in the *Metamorphoses*.

485 Note as well du Bellay’s reuse of the adjective *ignotus, -a, -um* at v. 16, an echo of Ovid’s use of
*ignotum* at v. 60.
thereby his heirs.\textsuperscript{486} So here du Bellay may be presenting himself, in referring himself to Ovid’s book, as Ovid’s heir as much as he is playing with the idea that he is the ‘thingness’ of the book.\textsuperscript{487} Their respective trajectories match: both du Bellay himself and the books of Ovid’s \textit{Tristia} find themselves compelled, despite their individual misgivings, from the fringes of outer areas of the Empire toward the center of Rome.

There is a contrast, however, in the desires of these two \textit{peregrini}: while Ovid’s book will be recognized specifically by its style (see \textit{colore}, v. 1.1.61) as being Ovid’s, and in a sense belonging to the Roman people, despite its desire to conceal itself, du Bellay, however, has a somewhat opposite dilemma and must try with all his might to fit in to his new surroundings (see vv. 7.17-18). It is just that in his efforts to do so he ironically becomes not Roman, but Ovidian, in large part due to his realization that the Rome he expected to find existed only in his head. In this sense the halls he must linger in are unfamiliar (v. 16), and the words he hears are foreign (v. 18) in a double fashion: they are not only strange to him as a Frenchman in Rome, but as a thwarted time traveler, as man who was promised one thing, but received something else entirely.

\textsuperscript{486} The best example is Tr. 1.1.105-122: Ovid’s other works are called the \textit{Tristia’s fratres} (v. 107); the books of the \textit{Ars} are called Oedipuses and Telegonuses (v. 114); he calls himself his book’s father (\textit{parentis}, v. 115).

\textsuperscript{487} It is also worth noting that Ovid calls his book a \textit{peregrinus} to emphasize its claims to Rome despite its being born in Tomis. Du Bellay may be playing with this idea as well. For this I am again indebted to Tom Hawkins, \textit{per sermonem}.
In typical Ovidian fashion, du Bellay proceeds with an *anthypophora* — that most nostalgic of rhetorical maneuvers.\(^{488}\) He anticipates the objections of his readership to his laments:

\[
\textit{At quid Romana (dices) speciosius Aula,}
\]
\[
\textit{Aut quisnam toto pulchrior orbe locus?}
\]
\[
\textit{Roma orbis patria est, quique altae moenia Romae}
\]
\[
\textit{Incolit, in proprio degit et ille solo.}
\]
\[
\textit{Forsan et est Romae (quod non contingere cuivis}
\]
\[
\textit{Hic solet externo) vivere dulce mihi...}
\]

But “What is more appealing than the court of Rome?” you will ask, or “What place in the world is more beautiful?”

“Rome is the world’s fatherland, and he who in the walls of lofty Rome resides, lives also in his native soil.”

Perhaps Rome (since it is not the lot of each and every exile to touch it) is a joy to me to dwell in...

(El. 7. 19-24)

These objections sound curiously like a summation of the praises of Rome offered in the *descriptio Romae* Elegy 2.\(^{489}\) Du Bellay’s appositive *dices* serves to reinforce my own reading of Elegy 2, which posits that the majority of the poem is not truly representative of the poetic voice of du Bellay, but rather a bland and general humanist idea of what Rome is sup posed to be.

Du Bellay’s answer to these hypothetical questions is suitably Ovidian as well, both in its nostalgic theme and its irony.

\[
\textit{At quotiens studia antiqua antiquosque sodales},
\]

\(^{488}\) See my discussion of the device in Ovid in section II. 1, above.  
\(^{489}\) See section II. 2b.
Et memini charam deseruisse domum,
Quondam ubi sollicitas Persarum temnere gazas,
   Et foelix parvo vivere doctus eram,
Ipsa mihi patriae toties occurrit imago,
   Et toties curis torqueor usque novis.
Utque nihil desit, nobis tamen omnia desunt,
   dum miseris noto non licet orbe frui.

But whenever I recall my old studies, my old companions, 
and remember deserting my beloved home, 
where once I learned to scorn solicitous Persian treasures, 
and was taught to live happy with little, 
every time, the very ghost of my homeland confronts me, 
and every time I am continuously racked with cares anew. 
And though I lack nothing, nevertheless everything has deserted me, 
while my miseries prevent me from enjoying a familiar world. 
(El. 7.29-36)

The recollection of former companions is a theme in the exile poems (for good examples, see Tr. 3.8.9 or 4.6.45; Ex P. 1.8.31). Though he is stationed in Rome—the acknowledged locus of humanist Classical learning—and employs the language of Rome, du Bellay takes this opportunity to pine for the intellectual companionship of his former colleagues, who are hundreds of miles away at the Parisian Collège de Coqueret.

Ovid, too, recalls his own home in similar fashion to du Bellay (at Tr. 3.4.57 and Ex P. 1.8.31-8). Demerson notes that while Ovid also uses the term imago in his own description (at Tr. 3.4.59: coniugis ante oculos, sicut praeentis, imago est, “the specter of my wife, as though present, appears before my eyes”),
he reserves it for a living being, his wife. Du Bellay’s adoption of the term from this Ovidian passage displays a similar sort of pessimism, common to both poets, namely, a pessimism that doubts whether what has been lost may ever be recovered, even in the event of a return. Ovid’s wife is as dead to him as if she had died (she never seems to write); she is gone for good. Yet, (as I have asked before,) what’s stopping her from coming to live with him, or simply visiting? The answer is that she cannot because she cannot go where Ovid the exilic poet has gone. For certain, she could come to Tomis, but the Ovid of the Tristia and Ex Ponto does not live in Tomis. Du Bellay’s Ovidian experiment has alienated his poetic personality from his home in the same way that Ovid has lost his wife: it remains only as a trick of the imagination, and even upon his return it will not exist for him in the same way that it did before.

The figure of Ulysses plays an important role in the section of the poem that follows. I have previously mentioned how du Bellay has grafted himself onto a palimpsest of exilic personae, which includes Ulysses, in both the

---

490 Oeuvres Latines, 286. The word, while it has a simple meaning of ‘image’ or ‘likeness’ in this instance may be better understood as ‘ghost’ or ‘specter,’ accompanied as it is by a genitive noun or adjective standing for a person. A parallel example from the Tristia would be Ovid’s description of his own reflection as mortis imago (“the specter of a dead man”) at 1.11.23. Furthermore, du Bellay’s own expression patriae imago, also occurs in the Tristia at 5.2.49 (o patriae per te florentis imago, “You image of the fatherland, flourishing on your account”) in a much more positive light. But it is noteworthy that this expression (in Ovid) creates and equation of person and patria like the allusion of du Bellay does by way of its equating his lost Anjou and Ovid’s wife.

491 As a comparandum consider du Bellay’s Sonnet 130 of the Regrets wherein, returned from Rome he writes (tr. Helgerson): “Alas, but after the weariness of such a long time away, I find in my house a thousand biting cares that gnaw at my heart without hope of relief. So adieu, Dorat, I am a Roman still...” (vv. 9-12).
dedicatory epigram and Elegy 1. Here the identification is much more explicit and works somewhat differently than in the previous poems. Here he connects himself to Ulysses through two potent double allusions to the *Tristia* and the *Odyssey*.

&Dag; Ast Ithacus, licet ipsa foret Laertia tellus  
   Et Bacchi et Ceres munerebus sterilis,  
In Patriam rediit, reditum nec pulchra Calypso,  
   Nec pulchra Alcinoi detinuit soboles.  
Foelix qui mores multorum vidit et urbes,  
   Sedibus et potuit consenuisse suis.  
Ortus quaeque suos cupiunt, externa placentque  
Pauca diu, repetunt et sua lustra ferae.  
Quando erit ut notae fumantia culmina villae,  
   Et videam regni iugera parva mei?  

But the Ithacan, although the land of Laertes itself was to be barren, lacking the gifts of Bacchus and Ceres, returned to his fatherland; his return neither lovely Calypso, nor the pretty offspring of Alcinoös could obstruct. Happy is he who has seen the cities and customs of many men is able to grow old in his home. Everything desires its own origin; foreign things that please for long are few; even beasts return to their lairs. When will it be that I see the smoking chimneys of my familiar home, and spy the meager acreage of my kingdom? (El. 7.41-50)

Let us examine du Bellay’s allusions as they occur. The first two are conjoined in the aphoristic couplet at vv. 45-6. The first line of this distich is a direct reference

---

492 See section II. 2a above.  
493 Du Bellay praises the fertility of his native Anjou in the few lines that immediately precede, with which this depiction of Ithaca is meant to contrast.
to the famous opening lines of the *Odyssey*, specifically v. 3: πολλῶν ἀνθρώπων ἴδεν ἄστεα καὶ νόον ἔγνω (“he saw the cities of many men and learned their ways”). The following verse (v. 46), alludes to the unfulfilled retirement that Ovid laments at *Tr.* 4.8.11-12: \[nunc erat ut deberem, v. 5\] / inque sinu dominae carisque sodalibus inque / securus patria consenuisse mea (“Now it were time that I ought to grow old in the bosom of my wife, dear ones, and companions, safe in my homeland”).

The second pair of allusions comes at vv. 49-50. In this instance, du Bellay’s verse may be traced through Ovid to the Homeric original. At *Ex. P.* 1.3.33-4, Ovid compares his own despair to that of Ulysses: *non dubia est Ithaci prudentia, sed tamen optat / fumum de patriis posse videre focis* (“the Ithacan’s foresight is not in doubt, yet he longs to be able to see the smoke of his paternal hearths”). This Ovidian quip hearkens back to the beginning of the *Odyssey* as well, namely Book 1.57-9, whereupon Athena communicates the depths of Odysseus despair to Zeus, saying *αὕταρ Ὄδυσσεὺς / ἱέμενος καὶ καπνὸν ἀποθρόσκοντα νοῆσαι / ἦς γαίης, θανέειν ἱμειρται* (“But Odysseus, hoping just to see the smoke wafting from his land, yearns to die”).

This passage is an elaborate tapestry of allusion, in which the threads that connect the three exiles cross over and pass through each other in such a way as to render the individual strands indistinguishable from the whole nostalgic tableau. The first pair of allusions (at vv. 45-6) amalgamates the long-suffering
Who exactly is the ‘happy’ one? Is du Bellay’s outlook optimistic or pessimistic? What does the couplet say about the fulfillment of the exile’s longing? Though the “Foelix qui” of v. 45 is rather obviously meant to be understood as Ulysses, the claim that the famous wayfarer wound up happily growing old in his home and du Bellay’s use of Ulysses as an example of the ‘happy home-comer’ is suspect. The return to Ithaca did not mean the end of Odysseus’s wanderings: he still had to fulfill the prophecy given to him by Tiresias in the underworld (in Book 11 of the *Odyssey*), namely that he must bear an oar in-land until he reached a people who knew nothing of sea-faring, whose ignorance would be marked by their calling the oar a winnowing fan. When this should occur, he was to plant the oar in the ground and establishing rites for Poseidon. Only then could he return home and die painlessly in old age surrounded by his family. Tiresias’ prophecy never specifies how long this task will take, nor does the seer guarantee that Ulysses will grow old *in Ithaca*.494 Du

---

494 In considering the success of Ulysses’s homecoming, we might also take into account du Bellay’s interaction with earlier vernacular tradition as well. Dante, in Canto 26 of *Inferno*, presents a Ulysses who relates the story of how, overtaken by wanderlust, he sails beyond the Pillars of Heracles and is killed in a shipwreck before Mount Purgatory. In fact Dante (Canto 26.94-102) may be an important intertext, as it presents Ulysses as the very sort hard-hearted man described in du Bellay’s opening lines to El. 7 (vv.1-6):
Bellay’s choice to echo Ovid’s pessimistic verse from the *Tristia* (v. 4.8.12) by using the verb *consenuisse*, ‘to grow into old age,’ may be an attempt to emphasize this uncertainty, in fact transforming the “Foelix qui” from a positive example of the exile’s recovery of homeland and happiness into a lament over the impossibility of true return, as though the two parts of the couplet—seeing the cities and customs of many men and growing old at home are mutually exclusive. Happy, then, is the man who can do the impossible. It is then better to have never left at all, as what is lost is irrecoverable.

In the second set of allusions, du Bellay’s reference to his “smoking chimneys” (v. 49) further accentuates the irony of du Bellay’s earlier lament for his former companions: just as the earlier verse (v. 29) alienated du Bellay from né dolcezza di figlio, né la pieta
del vecchio padre, né ’l debito amore
lo qual dovea Penelope far lieta,

vincer potero dentro a me l’ardore
ch’i’ ebbi a divenir del mondo esperto
e di le vizi umani e del valore;

ma misi me per l’alto mare aperto
sol con un legno e con quella compagnia
picciola da la qual non fui diserto.

Neither fondness for my son, nor filial duty towards my father, nor the love owed to Penelope, which should have made her joyous, was able to conquer the zeal that I had for exploring the world and seeing the vices and virtues of man. I set out on the high seas with a single ship and the companion by whom I was never deserted.

The debate over Dante’s influence on du Bellay has never been conclusively settled. A concise summary of the main issues (particularly concerning the poets’ respective attitudes toward the vernacular) can be found in Werner Paul Friederich, *Dante’s Fame Abroad: 1350-1850* (Rome: Storia e Litteratura, 1950), 72-4.
the humanist tradition of Rome, the Frenchman here alienates himself from the
site of Rome by utilizing a clever reversal of the trajectory of the exile’s desiderium
as it was shaped by Ovid, turning its focus outward from Rome through his
impersonation of Ovid’s own self-affiliation with Ulysses—the very tool with
which Ovid rooted the exile’s longing in the Eternal City. And again, a large part
of the irony relies on the fact that du Bellay does so while physically in Rome
itself, and in the language with which the term desiderium was defined.

As if he were in competitive rivalry with Ovid, seeking to out-exile the
famous exile, du Bellay creates for himself a double exile in Ovid’s own terms: he
is an Ovidian exile, cut off from his native France, but implicit in his Ovidian
stance is his severance from Rome as well. This ‘chiastic’ exile (introduced in a
chiastic construction, v. 29) places du Bellay at the center point of several
crossroads, spatial, temporal, and imaginative. In his desire to see the smoking
chimneys of Anjou, he crafts not simply a literary reproduction of the locus
classicus of nostalgic sentiment (at Od. 1.57-9), but rather a literary reproduction
of Ovid’s own literary replica of this prototypical image of homesickness. This
highly-contrived, mimetic passage adds to the perceived level of truthfulness in
du Bellay’s representation of himself and his circumstances, making his own
tribulation seem more ‘real’ in comparison with Ovid’s, in the same way that a
play-within-a-play creates a suspension of the audience’s disbelief in the
fictiveness of the external narrative. Once again, he hoists Ovid on his own
petard, as it was Ovid himself who stressed the fictiveness of Ulysses’s travails in contrast to the reality of his own at *Tr.* 1.5.79-80: *adde quod illius pars maxima ficta laborum; / ponitur in nostris fabula nulla malis* (“Furthermore, the greatest part of his labors are fiction; in my woes there is nothing made up”).

Du Bellay closes his poem by coming full-circle to the nautical imagery with which he began his elegiac cycle and evoking Ovid through a direct reference to the poet himself.

Now miserable and blindly tossed about in unfamiliar waters,
I entrust my sails to Latin straits.
Latium demands it; as a debt to the Roman tongue
this duty is owed; the very genius of the place pushes me to it.
Thus the one-time poet and teacher of tender love,
while he lived as an exile far removed from the borders of his fatherland,
pREFERRED TO HIS LATIN MUSES (FOR IT DID NOT SHAME HIM) THE BARBARIAN SONGS HE COMPOSED UPON A LYRE NOT FIT FOR THEM.
Poetry takes pleasure in princes and the theater’s applause;
He who pleases few pleases not his own self.

(E. 7.69-78)
The truncated summary of Ovid’s poetic career as du Bellay presents it vv. 73-4, which demonstrates a direct trajectory that begins from the tender love poet of the amatory works and ends with the banished exile of the Tristia and Ex Ponto, may reflect the perceived cause and effect relationship between the two incompatible extremes. It is more likely, however, that the explicit mention of these two bookends to Ovid’s career are meant to reflect the sudden turn in du Bellay’s own poetic trajectory. Just before he became the poet of exilic elegies and sonnets of regret, he had been the young love poet of L’Olive (published 1550), a collection of French love poems, modeled after Petrarch and largely responsible for the popularization of the sonnet in the French language.

Most importantly in the passage, du Bellay returns here in the end to the three main ideas of the dedicatory epigram with which he began his collection. Once again he resorts to the by now exceedingly familiar nautical metaphor for his sufferings (vv. 69-70); he reprises his linguistic concerns over his composition in a tongue unfamiliar to him (vv. 71-6); and he hearkens back to the first two lines of the dedication with his last two in Elegy 7, reiterating his anxieties over the poet’s role in pleasing his audience (vv. 77-8). Despite all of his poetic labor, du Bellay has ended up, in terms of his poetry, right in the exact place where he began. It is almost as though what passed for the experiences of his three years (according to v. 14) in Rome have had no effect; they might as well have never
happened. Du Bellay has inherited this aesthetic of stagnation from Ovid: it is a characteristic of the exilic space.\footnote{See section II.1 above.}

The linguistic concerns which dominate the ending have been touched on before, but here du Bellay makes it quite clear that he is an unwilling participant in the writing of Latin: the very land itself has made him its thrall, alienating him from his native French (and thereby from both his patroness and his fellow members of the Pléiade) while at the same time keeping him alienated from the native circles of humanist writers through his (attested) lack of facility with an unfamiliar tongue. All of this linguistic analogy seems to place du Bellay in the same unenviable situation as the exilic Ovid. Du Bellay’s composition, however, employs a unique and ironic twist which butts Ovid from the space of the ‘aesthetic patria’ of exile as du Bellay shapes it to his own purposes. Where du Bellay’s Latin would correspond to Ovid’s Getic, and du Bellay’s French to Ovid’s Latin, the analogy is undercut by the fact that du Bellay’s Latin (especially with the confines of Elegy 7) more directly corresponds to Ovid’s Latin.\footnote{For more, see Hinds (“Black Sea Latin,” 77), who also points out that du Bellay misreports on Ovid’s own feelings concerning his use of Getic. Though du Bellay says that Ovid was not shamed to do so (\textit{nece puduit}, v. 75), Ovid himself says the complete opposite at \textit{Ex. P.} 4.13.19, writing \textit{a, pudet, et Getico scripsi sermone libellum} (“Oh, it shames me! I have even written a book of poems in Getic speech’’). Hinds suggests that “perhaps what we should take from this rewrite is that du Bellay has enough lingering embarrassment about his own switch in poetic language to have coached his ancient character witness towards a more unequivocal statement of support,” (76).}

Furthermore, there is a great irony to du Bellay’s choice of Latin as his language of alienation. Ovid’s own choice of Getic as his own language of alienation.
alienation is clearly marked as a literary conceit due to the fact that “the language which will have filled up the gap left by any lack of local Latinity...is not Getic but Greek.” 497 Greek, to an upper-class, well-educated Roman such as Ovid, could not possibly provide the level of alienation that the exile poetry required. Du Bellay has turned this on its head: he has chosen Latin, a language directly associated with the educated and elite and which was becoming increasingly artificial and literary, to parallel Ovid’s use of a localized vernacular. When compared to Getic, Latin is paradoxically ubiquitous. Not to mention the fact that he crafts his whole collection of polished elegies in the language by which he is supposedly alienated. This is ultimately aimed at exposing Ovid’s aforementioned literary conceit, an act which, in effect, renders the ‘reality’ of his own poetry more plausible, in much the same way as his allusion to Ovid’s allusion to the *Odyssey* worked above. At the same time, however, du Bellay undercuts his own claims to reality by feigning alienation in a language that served as the *lingua Franca* and connected people of disparate languages from all across Europe. 498 This web of paradoxes disorient the reader, in effect leaving him feeling alienated from reality, thereby creating du Bellay’s desired aesthetic effect.

497 Ibid., 76.
498 Though it must be admitted that a *lingua Franca*, in its existence as a language in which varying cultures communicate, in effect untying from any locale, can “represent a psychological alienation that is universally understood” by its users (Tom Hawkins, *per sermonem*).
III. Conclusion

Though the detailed examination of only three of the Latin elegies (and one small epigram) contained in the first book of du Bellay’s *Poemata* cannot claim to paint an entirely comprehensive picture of his poetic program, it is clear that he was a poet with a developing plan. And though Ovid’s exilic poetry is arguably among the easiest to imitate, with its abundant tropes and regular forms of expression, du Bellay was not content to reproduce elegies that were merely Ovidian in their themes, style, and vocabulary. He saw fit to build and further develop the aesthetic crafted by the *Tristia* and *Ex Ponto* and put it to work for himself in his own unique ways.

Du Bellay, like Ovid, places his own poetic ‘homeland’ within the stream of traffic between several oppositional poles, toward which he often takes conflicting perspectives: this is how the exile crafts his own *patria* in the imaginary, nostalgic space, completely alienated from every place, person, time, and idea. But where Ovid’s exile works establish this imaginary country as adrift at a metaphorical four-way crossroads, caught between Rome and Tomis geographically and the irrecoverable past and an unrecognizable future (both of which come to exist entirely in the poet’s mind) in a temporal sense, du Bellay grafts his own unique axes on to this model. Paradoxically, these axes, whose fuller development is unique to the elegies of du Bellay examined here, are
inspired by elements within the exile poems to which du Bellay attempts to draw parallels (see Figs. 1 and 2 below).

The best example of this is du Bellay’s continual return to the theme of linguistic alienation, which in Ovid was only a small theme employed to heighten the exile’s alienation from Tomitan culture. In du Bellay’s elegies it becomes a fully developed axis. This is somewhat to be expected, considering du Bellay’s prior writings concerning the status of French vernacular vis-a-vis Latin in the Defense. Hence also he establishes an opposition between humanists and the Pléiade, alongside his estrangement, albeit in unique ways, from both parties. The resultant picture of du Bellay’s aesthetic space of exile reflected in Figure 2.

The analysis provided in this chapter began by addressing the dedicatory epigram and the content of Elegy 1 of the collection of Latin elegies contained in Book 1 of the Poemata, penned by du Bellay during his residence in Rome. Both poems employ themes from and allusions to the content of Ovid’s exilic works. These similarities demonstrate that du Bellay means for the reader to understand that he is writing in an exilic mode, and clearly establishes the Ovidian exilic persona as du Bellay’s inspirational model.
Figure 5.1: Diagram of Ovid's exilic situation
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Fig. 5.2: Diagram of du Bellay’s exilic situation
The analysis of the second elegy of the collection, the *descriptio Romae*, pointed out the shift in tone that occurs in the majority of the poem; this shift is at odds with the querulous tone taken in the first elegy that placed the reader in the context of exile poetry. I argued that the change in register may be understood as not truly belonging to the exilic persona of du Bellay. It is instead his own caricature of traditional idealization of both the ancient Romans as well as the physical site of Rome: with an abrupt change back into the exilic voice (signaled by his use of a common Ovidian trope) he makes it clear that to be in Rome is not necessarily to be in *ancient* Rome. The site of the city itself is deemphasized as a point of access to a unique and privileged experience of the ancient world by his unmasking of the fact that ancient Rome still exists in his time only as an imaginary concept that can be accessed from any geographical point, particularly through the ancient poets (hence his praise of and appeal to them at the end of the elegy). In sum, the ‘genius’ of Rome does not necessarily reside in Rome.

The examination of Elegy 7 which followed, entitled *Patriae desiderium*, showed du Bellay’s preparation of his own ‘aesthetic patria’ through his development of the same nostalgic space created by Ovid in the *Tristia* and *Ex Ponto*. This creation, while modeled on the ancient poet, was not without its own unique additions and modifications. Du Bellay shows that he is a metaphorical
fellow countryman of Ovid by adopting his language, much in the same way that Ovid’s exilic persona claimed to have written poetry in the vernacular Getic used in Tomis. The most important linguistic adoption in the poem is that contained in the title, the use of the term ‘desiderium’ as a descriptor for the feeling of nostalgic homesickness explored in his exilic oeuvre. Furthermore, throughout the poem runs a current of artistic competition, in which du Bellay attempts to outdo Ovid in his ‘exilic-ness’ and to present his own sufferings as more ‘real’ than those of the ancient poet. These acts are performed through a complicated web of allusions that stretches back through Ovid into the Odyssey of Homer, and the characteristically Ovidian use of paradox.

What is ultimately implied by the progression of these elegies is the decoupling of Rome (and by extension the Latin language) from the exilic lamentory tradition and its translation to an imagined aesthetic space, so that it may be taken up and moved, utilized with its trajectory pointed elsewhere than the Eternal City. Du Bellay in a sense seeks to liberate this aesthetic from Rome and Latin, in effect legitimizing his own composition and subsequent publication of the Regrets. The Regrets are the sort of vernacular poetry that represents the progress that du Bellay argued for in his literary manifesto, the Defense — poetry inspired by the spirit of the ancients, devoid of slavish linguistic imitation, that glorifies his native tongue through the incredibly difficult task of skillfully adapting the culturally and historically discrete literatures of ancient Greece and
Rome and expressing the ancients’ timeless ideas and aesthetics in a language not their own.
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