Personification and Depersonalisation as Unconscious Coping Mechanisms in Ovid's Exilic Texts

by

Angela Lengoloi van Rooyen

A dissertation submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree

MA Ancient Languages and Cultures

in the

Department of Ancient and Modern Languages and Cultures

of the

FACULTY OF HUMANITIES

UNIVERSITY OF PRETORIA

Supervisor: Dr. Susan L. Haskins

September 2023

Plagiarism declaration

Full names	Angela Lengoloi van Rooyen
Student number	17049050
Topic of work	Personification and Depersonalisation as Unconscious Coping Mechanisms in Ovid's Exilic Texts

Declaration

1. I understand what plagiarism is and am aware of the University's policy in this regard.

2. I declare that this __dissertation_____ (e.g. essay, report, project, assignment, dissertation, thesis, etc.) is my own original work. Where other people's work has been used (either from a printed source, internet or any other source), this has been properly acknowledged and referenced in accordance with the requirements as stated in the University's plagiarism prevention policy.

3. I have not used another student's past written work to hand in as my own.

4. I have not allowed, and will not allow, anyone to copy my work with the intention of passing it off as his or her own work.

Signature _____

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my deepest appreciation to my supervisor, Dr. Susan L. Haskins (University of Pretoria). Without her gentle guidance, meticulous attention to detail, and many phone calls and late nights, this dissertation, and my progress towards it, would not have been possible. I would also like to extend my sincere thanks to Adrienne Warricker (University of Pretoria) for helping me with each and every query I had regarding the acquisition of the sources necessary for this endeavour. I am also extremely grateful to Prof. Phil Botha (University of Pretoria), my editor, for agreeing to take on the task of revising my work. He has done an excellent job. Any remaining errors are my own. I would like to extend special thanks to Dr. Koos Kritzinger (University of Pretoria), who helped me in my time of need regarding some of the Latin translations required for certain parts of this dissertation. Additionally, I would be remiss not to mention Dr. Jo-Mari Claassen (University of Stellenbosch) and Dr. Andries Pieterse (Afrikaanse Protestante Akademie) for their invaluable feedback on my proposal. I would also like to thank Dr. Jo-Marí Schäder (University of Pretoria) for helping to foster my love for the ancient world. Lastly, I would like to thank all the individuals outside of academia who helped me along the way. In particular, my father, without whom I could not have come this far, as well as my partner, and those few close friends, who drew me out of my darkest moments, supported me in ways no others have, and always had time for my various, impassioned rants and raves about the ancient world, Ovid, and his life.

Abstract

In about 8-9 CE, the Roman poet Ovid was exiled. While there, he wrote several works, including the *Tristia* and the *Epistulae ex Ponto*. This dissertation examines the psychological underpinnings behind some significant characters in these exilic texts, created using personification and depersonalisation. Due to modern psychological theories, particularly the SEEK model of anthropomorphism, it is now possible to understand how the effects of isolation lead to the use of anthropomorphism and dehumanization as coping mechanisms. In his exilic works, Ovid extensively used the literary equivalents of these, namely personification and depersonalisation. This dissertation demonstrates that Ovid had a wide array of reasons, some of which are psychological, for the creation of these characters, namely, to construct entities that he could interact with and who could influence his life in some meaningful way. Using personification, he created the Comforting Muse and Book-as-Child character sets. Using a mixture of depersonalisation and repersonification, he created the Augustus-Jupiter and Pontus characters, as well as other characters, wherein Ovid depersonalises himself and others into body parts, objects, animals, and concepts. These characters typically comfort Ovid by helping him while in exile with his continued existence or with his ultimate goal: recall or providing entities to rebel against to gain catharsis instead of openly admonishing the emperor who exiled him. These characters' existence, made possible through personification and depersonalisation, fulfil Ovid's psychological need for human comfort while helping him overcome negative emotions.

Key terms: Personification, Depersonalisation, Exile, Ovid's *Tristia*, Ovid's *Epistulae ex Ponto*, Augustus-Jupiter, Comforting Muse motif, Book-as-Child motif, Pontus, Metaphor, Metonymy.

Table of contents

Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1   Introduction

The Roman poet Publius Ovidus Naso (Ovid), who wrote during the early Roman Empire, was exiled in 8 or 9 CE[1] to Tomis, a town on the western shore of the Black Sea, after offending the emperor Augustus through a "poem and a mistake" (*carmen et error*, *Tr*. 2.207).[2] The poem in question was likely the *Ars Amatoria* ("Art of Love"), written around 2 CE, which went against Augustus's new family-oriented goals for the empire by teaching women how to use the art of deception against their husbands.[3] However, not much is known about the mistake Ovid made due to Ovid's refusal to give many specifying details on the matter.[4]

While in exile, he wrote several texts. Two of these, the *Tristia* ("Sad Songs") and *Epistulae ex Ponto* ("Letters from the Black Sea"), are relatively autobiographical.[5] There is one other exilic text, the *Ibis*, but it is a scathing retort to an unnamed enemy. It focuses only on this enemy and

---

[1]   Claassen (1999:29). However, she later goes on to assert that 9 CE is the most probable year of Ovid's banishment (Claassen 2008:21).

[2]   Ovid was technically a *relegatus*, not an *exsul*. This means that he was relegated to Tomis instead of being truly exiled there. The only real difference between being relegated and being exiled is that one who is relegated retains their civil rights and property and citizenship while an exile is stripped of them (Jones 1964:8; *Oxford Latin Dictionary* 2ⁿᵈ ed. (*OLD* 2), s.v. "*relegatio*" 1a (Glare 2012); Wheeler ([1924] 1988:xviii). Possibly because of this, Ovid admonishes others for calling him an exile (*Tr*. 5.11.29). However, Ovid frequently refers to himself as an exile (e.g., *Tr*. 1.1.3; 3.1.1; 4.1.3; 5.9.6. *Pont*. 1.1.65; 2.6.3). For this reason, I will be referring to Ovid as an exile, and I will be referring to his punishment as exile. Although there are moments where a distinction is made in this dissertation, Ovid is treated overarchingly as an exile.

[3]   Fränkel (1945:111).

[4]   Examining the exilic texts, the reader finds that Ovid claims that his *error* was worse than murder (*Pont*. 2.9.72), yet he did not commit any crime (*Tr*. 1.2.98, 3.38; 4.10.90; 5.8.2. *Pont*. 1.6.25, 7.40, 44), but rather saw something, another individual's fault (*Tr*. 2.104), which made his eyes guilty (*Tr*.2.103; 3.5.49-50). There are two main stances in literature regarding the nature of Ovid's error: those who believe it to be a political issue, such as Green; or sources who believe it to be a moral misdemeanour, such as Norwood. Green believes that a part of Ovid's error must have been not only witnessing an offence, but also not reporting it to the authorities. Green also believes that Ovid may have been involved in some kind of pro-Julian plot against the succession of the Claudians. Green further argues that, given the long time between the publication of the *Ars* and Ovid's exile, that it was used as a cover to hide the nature of the *error* (Green, 2005:xxiv). On the other hand, Norwood cites Ovid's apparent disinterest in politics as justification for their beliefs (*Tr*. 1.9.18). Additionally, Augustus's granddaughter, Julia, was exiled for adultery in the same year in which Ovid was exiled to Tomis, leading some to believe there to be a possible connection between the two events (Norwood 1963:150). Some, like Boissier, believe that Ovid may have witnessed something scandalous happen between Julia and her co-adulterer at some party and had not reported it (Boissier 1885:141-4); while others, such as Norwood, believe that Ovid was unknowingly involved in the pro-Julian plot and was exiled as a form of silencing him (Norwood 1963:151).

[5]   Fulkerson (2023:114). For the purposes of this dissertation, all of the primary sources used are abbreviated in accordance with the *Oxford Classical Dictionary* 4ᵗʰ ed. (Hornblower et al.) (*OCD* 4)'s standard abbreviations list. The *Tristia* appears as *Tr*. and the *Epistulae ex Ponto* appears as *Pont*. The translations of the two main texts used are by Wheeler ([1924] 1988), Kline (2003) and Green (2005). This use of multiple translations is to assure that several possible interpretations of the text are examined.

does not show the same characteristics as these texts, which are relatively autobiographical and personal. As such, it does not fall under the scope of this dissertation.

In book one of the *Tristia*, Ovid describes his journey to Tomis. He goes on to address the emperor in the second book, making its relation to space and time nebulous, but he writes the third book as though he has just arrived in Tomis, where he begins to decline. In book four, he reminisces about his poetry and life as time passes steadily before becoming somewhat muddled in the fifth book, slipping between reprimanding and praising his wife and describing Pontus. In the *Epistulae ex Ponto,* Ovid writes letters to his wife and friends about his exile, his need for a change of place, and his health, memories, and future. Most of these letters have a negative outlook. These two works seem to give a personal insight into the exile's experience as they are apparently meant to be read as letters and poems written to correspond with those known personally by the poet back in Rome. The tone and content of these works suggest to the reader, both ancient and modern, that Ovid was in pain at having to be so far away from the cultural hub of ancient Rome, living with "barbarians" in a frozen wasteland under constant threat of raids and attacks.

An article by Claassen (1990) on the wavering of Ovid's identity during his exile suggests that he was suffering from psychological trauma that may have manifested itself in the *Tristia* and the *Epistulae ex Ponto*. Claassen noted an increase in the use of personification in these texts, which coincides with a depersonalisation of the narrator himself.[6] These trends suggest that Ovid was undergoing psychological degradation, as modern psychological theory suggests a link between psychological degradation and an increased sense of depersonalisation by an individual. This altered sense of identity is prevalent especially when the individual is undergoing some form of grave psychopathology or an extreme change in circumstances.[7] Furthermore, the SEEK Model of Anthropomorphism shows a link between a different form of psychological degradation,[8] caused by isolation and loneliness, and an increase in an individual's tendency to use anthropomorphism. This anthropomorphism is used in an attempt to turn non-humans, such as animals and objects, into "people" with whom the individual can interact to cope with the social disconnection caused by their isolation and loneliness. Additionally, reasons for someone engaging in the opposite of anthropomorphism,

---

[6]   Claassen (1990:104).
[7]   Handel (1987:321).
[8]   "SEEK" stands for the three components which comprise the model: sociality motivation, effectance motivation, and elicited agent knowledge. These three components are explored on page 17 as a part of the discussion of the conceptual and theoretical framework that was used during the course of this dissertation.

dehumanisation, are proposed. Namely, if an individual sees no future in which they will come into contact with or want to come into contact with another, they are likely to remove human characteristics from the individual or group of individuals. However, the study is unclear on whether this use of anthropomorphism and possibly even dehumanisation is conscious or unconscious.[9] I believe that they can be both.

Ovid's expression of his unconscious thoughts, needs, and desires in his texts can be psychologically analysed through psychoanalytical literary criticism. This form of literary criticism proposes that an author expresses pieces of their unconscious desires and fears through their works. It uses Freudian tenets as tools for analysis and has been updated constantly through the years.[10] Francis (2023) argues that a diagnosis of the author, gleaned through literary criticism, is dubious, at best,[11] a belief with which I agree. However, through literary criticism, I believe inferences can be made about the writer's psychology or mental state, although not their psychopathology, thus any mental disorders they might have had.

As modern scholars, we can never know whether or not exiled Ovid made significant use of anthropomorphism in his daily speech or if he dehumanised those around him in his mind. Still, we can analyse his use of personification and depersonalisation in his exilic texts as literary forms of anthropomorphism and dehumanisation, respectively.[12] While personification is a standard literary device used by many ancient Latin authors,[13] including Ovid, Ovid made significant use of it throughout his exilic texts. The same is true of depersonalisation. The unique circumstances of his exile suggest that while Ovid actively used personification and depersonalisation as literary techniques, he might also have had unconscious psychological motivators for using these devices.

I propose that, as a response to the trauma of exile, Ovid was personifying inanimate objects and abstract concepts and often depersonalising himself and others while simultaneously repersonifying the now depersonalised body part to fill the mental and physical space around

---

[9] Epley et al. focuses on anthropomorphism and only has a short section on dehumanization, so dehumanization is not elaborated on to the degree which anthropomorphism is.

[10] See 1.3 Conceptual and Theoretical Framework.

[11] Francis (2023:145).

[12] Anthropomorphism can be viewed as the real-world counterpart of the literary technique of personification, as both actions involve imbuing non-humans with human qualities, albeit in different contexts. Additionally, while they are not identical in connotation, dehumanization can be viewed as a real-world version of depersonalisation as they both remove human qualities from humans, essentially creating non-humans.

[13] Some examples of this are Vergil's multiple personifications of the seasons in his *Georgics* (Verg. *G.* 1.314; 2.315; 2.325-9; 2.337), and Horace's double personification of the cardinal wind, Zephyr, and subsequently the season, winter, in his *Odes* 1.4 (Hor. *Carm*. 1.4.1-2).

him with entities. Despite the apparent contradiction of this latter point, this simultaneous use of techniques allowed Ovid to depersonalise characters he perceived as negative and then repersonify them again to not lose from the "net number" of entities surrounding him. I further propose that these characters perform psychological functions for him, namely helping or hindering him in his goal of recalling or continuing existence.

In particular, Ovid created four main characters of his exile using these techniques. Some were created using only personification, and some using combined simultaneous depersonalisation and repersonification. He also created numerous minor characters through this simultaneous depersonalisation and repersonification. The characters Ovid created using these techniques played a significant psychological role for him, either comforting or oppressive. Thus, this study intends to provide a new perspective on the motives behind Ovid's use of personification and depersonalisation to illuminate an additional perspective on the debate on the nature of Ovid's use of these techniques. I intend to provide a possible reason why Ovid used these techniques in the way he did and what using them means about his possible psychological state during his exile. This is accomplished through reading Ovid's *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto* using Claassen's article as a starting point on the literary side, and the psychoanalytical literary criticism and the SEEK Model on the theoretical side, to form a two-pronged approach to a more psychologically orientated, yet still literary-based, in-depth reading of Ovid's exilic texts.

1.2   Definition of key terms

As literary and psychological terminology forms the heart of this study, these terms must be laid out and defined.

1.2.1   Literary terms

1.2.1.1 Personification

Personification is the first of the literary terms of great significance when undertaking this analysis. Personification is a technique frequently used by Ovid to convey his psychological reaction to exile. Personification is most commonly known as a literary device in which human form, nature, or characteristics are attributed to something not human; the representation of a thing or abstraction as a person; or (less commonly) the symbolic representation of a thing or

abstraction by a human figure.[14] Personification can be seen as the literary expression of anthropomorphism since personification can, in fundamental understandings of the terms, be used interchangeably with the term anthropomorphism.[15] This is possible because they have near-identical meanings, with anthropomorphism defined as the "tendency to imbue the real or imagined behaviour of non-human agents with humanlike characteristics, motivations, intentions, or emotions".[16] However, it would appear that their main difference is that anthropomorphism is used more commonly in fields outside of literature and usually refers to more physical representations of anthropomorphic figures. In contrast, personification is typically used in fields relating to literature and literary studies. However, the two overlap in their basic tenets and possibly their essential functions.[17]

There are many different levels of personification which need to be outlined, as there are several major categories of personification. Three of these categories, namely full personification (proposopoeia), the pathetic fallacy, and the apostrophe, can be found in exilic Ovidian literature, although a portion of one of the categories, the pathetic fallacy, does not fully fall into the scope of this dissertation. This is because of how widespread and unrelated it is to the study since it is not really used to create overarching characters who influence Ovid's life. As I have shown above, the aspects of personification that are focused on can be individually identified. However, there is no distinction between them in the following analyses as they are not different in nature, with one category, like the pathetic fallacy, falling under the umbrella term of personification. However, it is important to show what exactly is considered under the umbrella category of personification, as the individual categories are distinct in their

---

[14] *The Oxford English Dictionary* 2nd ed. (*OED* 2), s.v., "personification" (Simpson & Weiner 1989). It is also defined by Abrams and Harpham as when an "[i]nanimate object or abstract concept is spoken of as though it were endowed with life or with human attributes or feelings" (Abrams & Harpham 2015:135).

[15] Anthropomorphism is defined as: "The attribution of human form, character, or attributes to God or a god; the attribution of human personality or characteristics to something non-human, as an animal, object, etc." (*OED* 2, s.v. "anthropomorphism" [Simpson & Weiner 1989]).

[16] Epley et al. (2007:864).

[17] Claassen's view of what constitutes personification seems to be quite rigid, as compared to mine, with her also highlighting the pathetic fallacy as being one of the more common Ovidian personification techniques (Claassen 1990:103). However, according to Claassen, it is a lesser form of personification and seems to have been excluded as a source of personification from her article. Claassen also writes of the different degrees in the conceptualisation of personification, namely the apostrophe, which is similar in nature of being a lesser form of personification to the pathetic fallacy, which she states is no more than a useful means of plastic scene-setting. The apostrophe she speaks of seems to be the application of typically human nouns, adjectives and verbs to non-humans, such as when she notes that sometimes, "personification" is limited to the use of a human verb seen in instances such as *Epistulae ex Ponto* 4.13.39-40 where a "sixth winter sees" Ovid in his suffering (Claassen 1990:106) . She states that this "personification" is purely ornamental and has no wider symbolic outreach and calls it "petrified personification". Claassen does not question the psychological purpose of this personification or imply that it has any wider reach than simple scene-setting.

differing degrees of personification, particularly to what extent which kinds of animals, objects and concepts are given life and the category's primary characteristics.

1.2.1.2   Full personification (prosopopoeia)

Personification as a stand-alone term has been relatively simple to define. In rhetoric, a field in which Ovid was well-versed due to his training in the liberal arts,[18] personification of animals, plants, elements of nature and abstract ideas was common. Personification can be used as a stand-alone literary technique in its own right, as well as a metaphor or allegory,[19] in which a non-human entity is referred to as though it were human,[20] in expressed characteristics or form.[21] This is commonly seen in verse where the moon is referred to with female pronouns, similarly to how ships and countries are referred to using gendered pronouns.[22]

This category is the most clearly seen of the three as it distinctly ascribes human qualities to non-humans. The following two categories, pathetic fallacy and apostrophe, are decidedly less evident to the reader as they each fall short of the classification of full personification. However, each is considered to fall under the umbrella term of personification within the scope of this study.

1.2.1.3   Pathetic fallacy

The pathetic fallacy is slightly below personification in terms of the degree of life given to a non-human thing. The pathetic fallacy is a poetic literary term highly popular in the 18th and 19th centuries,[23] in which nature and natural phenomena were described as being able to feel human emotions and sympathies[24] as well as dispositions and reactions that usually can only

---

18   See Chapter 2.
19   *The Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms*, 4th ed. 2015 (*ODLT* 4), s.v. "personification" (Baldick 2015).
20   *A Dictionary of Psychology*, 4th ed. 2015 (*DP* 4), s.v. "personification" (Colman 2015).
21   *The Oxford Companion to English Literature*, 7th ed. 2009 (*OCELit* 7), s.v. "personification" (Birch 2009).
22   *The Oxford Companion to the English Language*, 2nd ed. 2018 (*OCELan* 2), s.v. "personification" (McArthur et al. 2018).
23   The term "pathetic fallacy" was coined by a Victorian art critic named John Ruskin in his *Modern Painters* (1856), due to his strict views about the accurate representation of nature, which led him to differentiate between poets who used the device sparingly, like Shakespeare, and those who made excessive use of it, like Wordsworth, to whom, in Ruskin's opinion, "a primrose is anything else than a primrose" (*The Concise Oxford Companion to English Literature*, 4th ed. 2013 (*COCEL* 4), s.v. "pathetic fallacy" [Birch & Hooper 2013]). Ruskin's interpretation placed these poets in a hierarchy, with those who make little use of the device being perceived as being greater poets than those who make frequent use of the device, which he called "lesser poets" (*ODLT* 4, s.v. "pathetic fallacy" [Baldick 2015]). However, it must be noted that the meaning of the term has changed as the words that it is made up of and the original meanings have become largely obsolete. In Ruskin's day, the word pathetic meant anything pertaining to emotion and fallacy meant a falseness (*Oxford English Dictionary*, 1st ed., s.v. "pathetic"; s.v. "fallacy" [Murray 1928]).
24   *COCEL* 4, s.v. "pathetic fallacy" (Birch & Hooper 2013).

be experienced by animate creatures and humans.[25] Instances of pathetic fallacies typically involve a metaphor that, on its own, can fall short of meeting the requirements of full-scale personification, as pathetic fallacies do not typically involve physical actions or characteristics but only emotions or dispositions.[26] As such, the personified concepts are narrower, and the degree of life given to them is less.[27]

1.2.1.4 Apostrophe

The final form of personification necessary to examine is the apostrophe. However, it is a technique that is partially covered by the term personification in this dissertation. This is because Ovid often uses it as a rhetorical device to talk to friends and loved ones through his letters, mainly in the *Epistulae ex Ponto*. For this reason, I have not examined all instances of Ovid's use of the apostrophe as he does not always use it to create a character who influences his life but often uses it simply to talk to loved ones or others who are not physically there with him.

Apostrophe (Greek, "to turn away")[28] is a rhetorical figure in which the speaker rhetorically addresses a dead or absent person, abstraction[29] or inanimate object as though the addressee can hear them and or respond,[30] and often involves the employment of a human noun, verb or adjective concerning a non-human.[31] It is used in classical rhetoric to denote the speaker turning to address a member or section of the audience and is appropriate to the genres of ode and elegy.[32] However, most modern definitions of this device seem to have expanded the meaning beyond the context of formal rhetorical discourse. A unique form of classical use of the apostrophe seen in epic poetry is when the poet invokes a muse, a topic that recurs consistently

---

[25] *DP* 4, s.v. "pathetic fallacy" (Colman 2015).
[26] *ODLT* 4, s.v. "pathetic fallacy" (Baldick 2015).
[27] Examples of this technique are: a violent storm (*Wuthering Heights,* Bronte), a weeping cloud (*Ode to Melancholy,* Keats), and wretched weather (*Great Expectations,* Dickens). This technique was most commonly used to represent the inner turmoil of the characters or the author, but the meaning has since evolved to refer to the ascription of any emotion or disposition to any natural animate or inanimate object or phenomenon.
[28] *OCELit* 7, s.v. "apostrophe" (Birch 2009).
[29] *COCEL* 4, s.v. "apostrophe" (Birch & Hooper 2013).
[30] It would appear that, originally, the apostrophe was used as the invocation opening of epics such as Homer's *Iliad*. It is later referred to as a momentary interruption of rhetoric discourse in order to address a real or imaginary, present or absent, human or non-human, living or dead addressee, different to the original addressee of that discourse (Mayoral 2006).
[31] Claassen (1990:104).
[32] Ruskin (1856:160-1).

in Ovid's exilic poetry.[33] The device is usually employed for emotional emphasis and is frequently found and used appropriately in the speeches of Shakespeare's characters, for example, when Elizabeth in *Richard III* addresses the Tower of London, "Pity, you ancient stones, those tender babes". When misapplied, as in Wordsworth's "Spade! With which Wilkinson hath tilled his lands", the apostrophe can seem ridiculous.[34] It seems that Ovid makes appropriate use of this technique almost to excess in his exilic literature, as many of his personifications simply involve the implementation of a human word to a non-human, such as a swallow having a cradle (*Tr.* 3.12.9-10) or rocks that are described as blushing with roses (*Pont.* 2.1.36).

For this dissertation, Ovid's use of the literary technique of personification is more fully viewed as an expression of an internal need to engage in anthropomorphism in reaction to the psychological effects of his exile.[35] However, the term needs a more expanded definition for use in this discussion as it does not simply refer to the primary literary technique but rather the phenomenon of Ovid's use of it and related techniques and how they specifically relate to him and his situation, such as his frequent use of the pathetic fallacy. Thus, the term personification is defined in this dissertation as Ovid's tendency to ascribe agency, emotions, thoughts, responses and other typically human characteristics to objects, entities, and concepts that are decidedly non-human in nature but not necessarily in form.

1.2.1.5 Depersonalisation

Depersonalisation is the next concept necessary to elucidate for this study. In her 1990 article, Claassen analyses Ovid's depersonalisation from various angles. While she does not define depersonalisation on its own, she does juxtapose it with personification, saying that they are opposites. However, several definitions exist for the word depersonalisation, depending on the context.

---

[33] While Ovid's exilic literature does not fall into the genre of epic as it is written as elegy, Ovid makes numerous comparisons between himself and notable epic characters from the *Iliad*, *Odyssey* and *Aeneid*. These references abound as Ovid almost always brings these characters up as an allegory for himself or to prove a point about his situation. However, he often compares himself to them while providing the impression that his situation is far worse than theirs (*Tr.* 1.9.; 3.11, etc.) This could be an attempt to build atmosphere, simply liken himself to these characters, or (as a possible attempt to console himself over what was an incredibly traumatic time of his life), by making it appear as some epic Hero's Journey.

[34] *ODLT* 4, s.v. "apostrophe" (Baldick 2015).

[35] The reason for the exclusion of the word "anthropomorphism" from this term's section is because this dissertation views anthropomorphism as the psychological or physical action of giving human qualities to non-humans which is expressed in Ovid's literature through the basic literary technique that will be referred to as "basic personification".

The definition Claassen uses for depersonalisation is quite far removed from the definition of the term when used in a clinical psychology setting. However, the clinical psychology definition of depersonalisation must be understood as it seems that Ovid undergoes this process to some degree throughout his exile.[36] In clinical psychology, the term depersonalisation is explored with a deeper focus as it forms a part of psychological diagnostics. In this context, depersonalisation refers to an altered mental state involving self-awareness in which the person experiences a form of disconnection or detachment between their mental and physical selves in various ways,[37] including issues with body image, subjective memory, dulled emotions and "derealisation".[38] Derealisation is a feeling of being cut off from the world as if the world is not real. People often describe it with visual metaphors such as looking at the world through a camera, a mist, or a veil. [39] This does not mean that the person is experiencing visual hallucinations but is having trouble colouring their perception with typically accepted emotions and feelings, giving their perception of reality a lack of vividness and immediacy.[40] It could be argued that Ovid's fantastical descriptions of Tomis and its surroundings, examined in Chapters 2 and 4, are an expression of feeling as though the world around him is not real.

Internally, the person feels dead, loveless or lifeless, like an automaton with their body feeling as if it is carrying on with what they would have been doing without their input. Schilder describes people suffering from depersonalisation as feeling like they have no control over their surroundings or actions and that what they do feels mechanical. These people claim they no longer feel joy, sorrow, hatred, or love. They do not feel alive or dead or experience hunger or thirst. They may begin to forget how their loved ones look.[41] A person experiencing depersonalisation might have trouble remembering events or feeling like the experience had not happened to them.[42] Externally, the person might appear normal to others in conversations and the expression of emotions.[43] This is one of the main features of depersonalisation; it is about how the person feels they are perceiving the world. It cannot be easily seen by another person and usually needs the person experiencing it to describe their experience to fulfil the

---

[36] This is discussed briefly towards the end of Chapter 2, when Ovid's psychological state during exile is explored.
[37] Roth (2006).
[38] Sierra et al. (2005).
[39] I personally have experienced it as feeling as though I am looking at the world and my actions through a tunnel and I feel as though I am watching my hands do actions from a spot just behind my head.
[40] Sierra (2010).
[41] Schilder (1953:304-5).
[42] Sierra (2010).
[43] Roth (2006).

diagnosis requirements. Ovid seems to experience some of these symptoms and writes about them in his exilic texts. He mainly expresses feeling neither alive nor dead, wanting to be dead or already being dead.

People who have survived traumatic experiences and imminent death situations will describe their mental state in those moments like a person with depersonalisation would. It is believed that the survivors experience this depersonalisation as a defence response to the severe anxiety that their near-death would have caused them, displacing their conscious self, who is experiencing debilitating emotions such as anxiety and fear, from their external self, who has very dulled emotional responses to the event and is more capable of self-preservation. Due to this, it is believed that depersonalisation is a faulty, exaggerated and prolonged form of this self-preservation response to traumatic situations.[44] This lines up with Ovid's situation as he describes often feeling as though his life was in imminent danger, making it possible that he was experiencing both psychological depersonalisation and this kind of depersonalisation as a survival instinct.

Separately from both definitions of depersonalisation, there is a literary technique involving Claassen's type of depersonalisation named antiprosopopoeia. Antiprosopopoeia comes from the Greek *anti* "opposite", *prosopon* "face" or "person", and *poiein* "to make". It is the exact opposite of personification (prosopopoeia). It refers to the representation of people as inanimate objects and can be used as a metaphor to depict or describe a person, for example, "she was a doormat upon which the tread of too many boots had scraped".[45] This word is not widely used in modern English.

The best way to define depersonalisation for the discussion at hand is to base it on that of Claassen in her article. Depersonalisation is a literary technique used to convey a psychological response to exile, whereby Ovid removes the humanity or state of being human from humans.[46]

1.2.1.6 Intrapersonal and interpersonal depersonalisation

There are two kinds of depersonalisation that Ovid makes use of in his exilic texts: intrapersonal and interpersonal. In this dissertation, intrapersonal depersonalisation is the

---

[44] Noyes & Kletti (1977:383-4).
[45] Bullinger (1898:870).
[46] However, it must be remembered that Ovid almost always uses simultaneous depersonalisation and repersonification, or simply depersonalisation and personification in conjunction, to create his depersonalised characters.

literary depersonalisation of the self and interpersonal depersonalisation is the literary depersonalisation of others.

Each of the abovementioned kinds of depersonalisation has three individual categories, which I have created, into which they can be split: agency-based (simple) depersonalisation, metaphorical (intermediate) depersonalisation, and complex depersonalisation. These categories are used to distinguish between the differing ways in which Ovid uses depersonalisation as a technique to depersonalise individuals in his exilic texts. The individuals Ovid depersonalises range from himself and loved ones, such as friends and his wife, to his readers and people who have antagonised him. Ovid depersonalises these individuals in many ways, which is why these ways have been sorted into three broad categories.

The first category, agency-based or "simple" depersonalisation, is a form of depersonalisation that involves removing an individual's agency and instead placing the burden of actions and emotions onto a less developed but now-personified body part or human-based concept. Examples of this are shown when Ovid says that his "feet" (*pes*) deliberately slowed down (*tardus*, *Tr*. 1.3.56) to match his intent on the night he left Rome or when he writes that his "spirit" (*animus*) supports the emperor Augustus (*Tr.* 2.55).

The second category is metaphorical or "intermediate" depersonalisation. This form of depersonalisation involves depersonalising an individual through the use of metaphor and metonymy into a now-personified object or animal. Examples of this are seen when, for instance, Ovid says at multiple points that he is a wrecked ship or a "shipwreck" (*naufragus*, e.g., *Pont*. 4.4.8).

The final category is complex depersonalisation. This form of depersonalisation is a category of many exceptions, but they are drawn together in that they require far more cognitive effort to create on the part of the author as these depersonalisations are often consistent conceits or concepts which span the exilic works instead of making appearances in passing. Examples of the complex depersonalisation category range from Ovid playing with the idea of being dead (e.g., *Tr*. 3.11.25-32) to the creation of complex characters, such as the Augustus-Jupiter oppressive character, which is a depersonalisation of the emperor Augustus into the non-human god, Jupiter, through a close identification of the emperor to the god, with Ovid often referring to Augustus by referring to Jupiter (e.g., *Tr.* 1.5.78).[47]

---

[47]   Here Jupiter is classified as a non-human. This is because the Roman gods were not considered to be human even though they were later depicted anthropomorphically, in accordance with the ancient Greek depictions

1.2.2 Psychological terms

1.2.2.1 Unconscious coping mechanisms

The psychological concepts used in conjunction with these literary terms to facilitate the main discussion of this investigation, namely unconscious coping mechanisms, and metaphor and metonymy, must be outlined as they either frequently occur in the exilic texts or are crucial to understanding Ovid's psychological reasons for creating the characters that are discussed throughout this study. The first and foremost of these terms required to understand Ovid's psychological reasons behind creating his characters is the unconscious coping mechanism. The title of this study states that Ovid uses unconscious coping mechanisms to deal with the psychological reaction of being exiled. This might seem like a misnomer as coping strategies are typically known to be conscious processes,[48] with defence mechanisms (or coping styles) being understood as unconscious processes.[49] However, there are functions of both coping strategies and defence mechanisms that Ovid uses, all of which seem to be bordering on the conscious while remaining relatively unconscious or, at the very least, unexplained by him as being conscious processes in his texts. Additionally, there are relatively few differences between coping strategies and defence mechanisms, with two of their three goals being identical: to decrease negative effects and to return the individual to their baseline functioning as quickly as possible.[50] It is in the third goal or purpose where the difference between the two is seen. An individual using coping strategies will actively try to solve or manage their problem

---

of their gods, for poetic and political reasons (Powell, 2015:633-6). Initially, Roman gods were not anthropomorphic and were depicted through representations of their symbols or the elements they held dominion over (Woodburn Hyde 1946:9). Subsequently, the ancient Romans seemed to view the newly anthropomorphised gods as "humanized" or "human-like" but not personified into human beings, as there was a sharp distinction drawn between those who originally were and those who originally were not immortal, with even deified emperors remaining separated from their Olympian counterparts on this basis (Serv. *Ad Aen.* 5.45).

[48] Cramer (1998:921).

[49] Cramer (1998:924). The concept of defence mechanisms was coined in Sigmund Freud's early papers published in the late 1800s and were originally understood as unconscious mental operations that kept painful thoughts out of an individual's awareness. The theory behind them was then expanded in the mid 1900s by Anna Freud. There has been inconsistency in the scholarly attention paid to, and the level of seriousness with which, defence mechanisms have been regarded through the years. However, this mainly stemmed from issues with laboratory testing of the individual tenets of regression and projection. The laboratory testing did not prove fruitful which led to a decline in the study of defence mechanisms in the 1970s. However, there is a modern-day resurgence in the wake of new theoretical ideas and research approaches. See Cramer (2000) for an exploration of the rise and fall of the defence mechanism and how it is viewed today.

[50] Cramer (1998:923-4).

consciously, while an individual engaging in defence mechanisms will also seek to solve or manage the problem but will do so unconsciously.[51]

Many kinds of unconscious defence mechanisms or coping styles have been identified,[52] but it would seem that several of these mechanisms combine to form the impetus behind the construction of the characters seen in Ovid's exilic texts. Examples of these defence mechanisms are things such as "acting out", whereby an individual carries out impulsive behaviours without thinking about the negative consequences, or "altruism", whereby an individual overcomes internal prohibition by transferring "prohibited" desires onto someone else who they then try to satisfy the need in altruistically.[53] However, it must be noted here that this dissertation does not inherently seek to understand Ovid in terms of his psychological defence mechanisms but rather from a more literary perspective.

As with personification and depersonalisation, this dissertation seeks to provide a term to encapsulate Ovid's specific situation of wavering between the conscious construction of characters and his unconscious psychological motivations for creating them and has concluded that the term "unconscious coping mechanism" is suitable for this phenomenon which encapsulates both unconscious mechanisms such as condensation and displacement as well as conscious actions such as the construction of characters, towards achieving an internal equilibrium.

1.2.2.2 Metaphor and metonymy as psychological constructs

The second concept that must be outlined due to the frequency of its occurrence is Lacan's conceptualisation of metaphor and metonymy as literary expressions of two psychological mechanisms. Renowned French psychoanalyst Jacques Lacan was the first to recognize a link between linguistics and psychoanalysis. He proposed that metaphor and metonymy were the literary equivalents of two unconscious psychological mechanisms: condensation and

---

[51] Cramer (1998:924).

[52] A tiered list of all thirty-one coping styles can be found in the *DSM-IV*, pp. 751-3, which seems to have been inspired by the hierarchical categorization of the unconscious defences that was found in Vaillant (e.g., 1977, 1992). The source that is used for this dissertation's interpretation of defence mechanisms is Perotta (2020) because of its recency and the fact that it draws on several seminal works to create a concise overview of the topic at hand.

[53] The example given of this by Perotta is when someone dedicates themselves to voluntary oncology because of a loved one in an attempt to try to stay close to those in the same position in order to help heal their own wounds (Perotta 2020:2).

displacement.[54] Condensation is a process whereby the associations and emotions linked to several emotions, ideas or memories are attached to one thing, which stands as a symbol for these things. Condensation is seen especially in dreams, where ideas and emotions can become compressed into one concept, person or object that becomes a symbol for all of its constituent parts. The Pontus character is a condensation as it is a symbol for all components of Ovid's exile, the terrible conditions he suffers, and his feelings of being trapped and tortured. Displacement is a defence mechanism through which emotions are redirected from their original target to a substitute related to the original through a chain of associations.[55] The individual considers this substitute less threatening than the original target; thus, the process of displacement allows the individual to express their emotions while avoiding the threat posed by the original target.[56] A good Ovidian example of displacement is seen with the Augustus-Jupiter character, created as a safer substitute for Ovid to vent his feelings about Augustus onto as it cannot retaliate against him in any way.

In Ovid's exilic literature, the use of metaphor and metonymy as psychological mechanisms is very common, with the techniques being used individually in instances such as the Ovid-as-ship depersonalisation metaphor seen in Chapter 4 and the metonymy involved in creating the Augustus-Jupiter character through references to Augustus as Jupiter (e.g., *Tr*. 2.190). But what is interesting about Ovid is that he often uses both of these literary techniques in a way similar to their original purposes, albeit in a slightly more complex and interwoven way by, for example, merging the two techniques and adding personification to create characters that he can interact with. Ovid does not simply use another name for a person or place. He creates a metaphorically explored, personified character around the metonym and has this newly created character influence his life in some way. Ovid does this with his Comforting Muse, Books as Children, Augustus-Jupiter and Pontus characters.

---

[54] Lacan reached his conclusion by being inspired by the work of Sigmund Freud on unconscious mechanisms (seen most prominently in his *Interpretation of Dreams* [Freud 1900:261-88]) and American Linguist and literary theorist, Roman Jakobson, who proposed the idea that there are two poles of language along which discourse can develop based on the similarity or contiguity of topics, expressed in their most condensed form as metaphor and metonymy, respectively (Jakobson & Halle 1971:90-6).

[55] Both condensation and displacement are processes identified, with regard to dreams and the unconscious mind, by Sigmund Freud, the father of psychoanalysis, in one of his seminal works, *The Interpretation of Dreams* (Freud, [1899] 1900).

[56] A relatively simple example of displacement is the scenario in which an employee is treated poorly by his boss and feels anger towards the boss but cannot act on the anger for fear of losing his job. So, when the employee returns home for the day, he might kick his dog as a way to release the pent-up aggression onto a less threatening subject. This process often involves hierarchical chains where, using the previous example, the employee might yell at his partner, who displaces their aggression onto their child, who then displaces their aggression onto the dog.

1.3   Conceptual and theoretical framework

The recognition that personification and depersonalisation could also be unconscious coping mechanisms when used as literary devices is now possible due to modern psychological theory. In order to carry out this study, it is necessary to analyse and discuss Ovid's possible psychological motivations for constructing characters and creating entities through a close reading of his exilic literature. This can best be accomplished by a combination of literary and psychological theories, specifically psychoanalytic literary criticism and the SEEK model of anthropomorphism. Although Ovid has been dead for centuries, it is possible to apply modern psychological theories to him. This is because psychological theories can be applied to people across time, as seen in modern psychological analyses of other literary figures which make use of theories such as psychoanalytic literary criticism.

Psychoanalytic literary criticism is a form of literary criticism conceptualised by Sigmund Freud, who first used psychological criticism and is often considered the father of modern psychology.[57] It draws many of its tenets from the psychoanalytic theory from which it is derived.[58] Psychological literary criticism, its predecessor, is described as dealing with: "[a] work of literature primarily as an expression, in an indirect and fictional form, of the state of mind and the structure of personality of the individual author."[59] The main crux of psychoanalytical criticism is the belief that a literary work is subject to unconscious mental phenomena. The application of psychoanalytic criticism provides a way to analyse an author's psychology through their works as they produce every part of the work, and it is inherently tied to their unconscious mind.[60] The main concepts that a psychoanalytic researcher looks for are condensation, displacement and symbolism.[61]

However, due to the reductionist tendencies among scholars of viewing an author's fictional texts as biographical information and a tendency to take a strong interest in analysing the author

---

[57] The concept of psychoanalytic literary criticism has prompted its fair share of scholarly debates over the years and has since branched off into several different areas based on schools of thought from Freudian to Lacanian in the early 20th century to more modern interpretations from the mid to late 20th century with Freudian tenets seeing a revival in the mid-20th century (Abrams & Harpham 2015:323).

[58] There is no one work from Freud that fully tackles psychoanalytic theory as he developed it throughout his career, and it formed part of his legacy. However, his first mention of it was in 1896 in his *L'hérédité et l'étiologie des névroses* ("Heredity and aetiology of neuroses").

[59] Abrams & Harpham (2015:319).

[60] Schmitz (2007:199).

[61] However, there is a strong sexual denotation with regard to symbolism (Abrams & Harpam 2015:320).

in terms of their sexual desires and repressions,[62] I have created my own version of this theory using several individual aspects of various facets of it.[63] Firstly, I have taken the basic method of traditional Freudian psychoanalytic criticism, namely, reading an author's works from a psychoanalytic perspective to gain insights into the unconscious mind of the subject of investigation. It is, therefore, possible to uncover the possible unconscious motivations Ovid had for writing what he did. However, my focus is not directed at the motivation of sex, which was Freud's primary concern. Instead, I focus on other unconscious driving forces, such as basic social needs and emotions. Secondly, I take a perspective similar to Derrida's supposition that a text is linked to one's psyche.[64] He believed an individual's unconscious desires, fantasies and fears are always expressed through language.[65] When examining Ovid's texts from this perspective, inferences about his unconscious can be gleaned through an analysis of what he wrote and how he wrote it because, in line with Derrida's supposition, Ovid could not fully divorce himself from his art.

Furthermore, I have used the Freudian concepts of displacement and condensation, as they are updated by Lacan to be used in a literary context, along with Freud's conceptualisation of unconscious motivations.[66] This is because I have identified that Ovid uses condensation and displacement to a significant degree in his creation of characters. This seems to be unconsciously motivated, to a degree, in that Ovid was not fully aware of why he was constructing characters in the way that he did. His desire for comfort and closure seems to have seeped out into his behaviours without him noticing. However, a critical note must be made here about the nature of this dissertation; it is in no way intended to be a psychology

---

[62] Schmitz (2007:199). Psychoanalytic literary criticism has not yet moved past Freud's apparent obsession with sex as the underlying motivation for all behaviour and the root of all trauma, as modern psychoanalysis has.

[63] I have not taken a stance adhering to Freudian psychoanalytic criticism as I have no interest in the supposed underlying sexual desires and repressed emotions of the exilic Ovid or analysing his text for phallic symbols. Other scholars such as Bonaparte (1949), Crews (1966) and Lawrence (1962 & 1977) have all applied Freudian psychoanalytic literary criticism to authors, characters, and the cultural placement of works, respectively, to varying degrees of success, although a simple psychoanalysis of an author has fallen into disrepute through history due to its reductionist tendencies (Wright [1984] 2005:38-45). I have also not taken the Lacanian route, which is quite removed from orthodox Freudianism, as it is also rather dated and relies on Freud's psychoanalysis, structuralism, and deconstructionism (Schmitz 2007:202).

[64] The reason why I am only taking the basic tenet of Derrida's is that, because he was a deconstructionist, his main perception falls squarely against this dissertation's stance that meaning can be found in Ovid's writing, as deconstructionism is a challenge to the attempt to discover any concrete meaning in texts.

[65] Wright ([1984] 2005:134).

[66] In relation to psychoanalytic theory, unconscious motivation is defined by the American Psychological Association as: "[w]ishes, impulses, aims, and drives of which the self is not aware". These unconscious desires will often find their way into an individual's behaviours without them realising the root issue, or even the behaviours themselves (Lumer, 2019:1).

dissertation. The psychological theories used will only serve as tools for analysis and aids in paths of inquiry.

The SEEK Model of Anthropomorphism, as provided by Epley et al. (2007), on the other hand, is a much newer theory. It, in fact, is one of the latest models in this field,[67] and it has been received quite well by the psychological community.[68] It still uses the original research of some major psychological influencers while also updating them.[69] In the paper "On Seeing Human: A Three-Factor Theory of Anthropomorphism", Epley et al. set out to explain when people are more likely to anthropomorphise and when they are not. They focus on three psychological determinants. Firstly, how easily "anthropocentric" knowledge, knowledge regarding humankind as a central element of existence, can be accessed and applied (termed "elicited agent knowledge"). Secondly, an individual's need to understand and explain the behaviour of agents, both human and non-human (termed "effectance motivation"); and thirdly, an individual's need for social contact and affiliation (termed "sociality motivation"). The paper then explores twelve independent variables, four for each of the three concepts influencing them. However, there is no focus placed on these variables as it would be impossible to interrogate a text to that degree, as it is not a person.

Epley et al. argue that, when elicited, an individual's agent knowledge and effectance motivation are high. When that individual lacks a social connection to others, they are more likely to engage in anthropomorphism as a means of assuaging loneliness and isolation or, to a lesser degree, confusion about the world around them.

Notably, the authors end with a short section on dehumanization, the antithesis of anthropomorphism, with a conclusion that understanding the psychological reasons why individuals see other agents, both human and non-human, as almost, but not quite, human, should also help with understanding why some people are less likely to do so, with one example stating that those whom an individual has no interest in understanding or no future chance of interacting with, are more likely to be dehumanized by the individual.

---

[67] This model also moves beyond application to robots and autistic children to average people and takes every possible angle of that person's life into its scope, allowing for a thorough examination. See Atherton & Cross (2018), Damiano & Dumouchel (2018) and Arienti et al. (2019) for examples of how other psychological models and theories are used in relation to autistic children and robots.

[68] See scholars such as Crowell (2019), Agrawal et al. (2020), and Koike & Loughnan (2021) for scholars making further use of the SEEK Model.

[69] The article includes works and references to some of the great modern psychologists such as John Bowlby (who conceptualised the term "attachment", a crucial concept in the paper) and Abram Maslow (father of the "hierarchy of needs", a concept which is blatantly an influence on some parts of the paper).

Both of these theories have been used in conjunction to guide my examination of Ovid's comforting and oppressive characters. Psychoanalytic literary criticism provides a perspective that is important when reading Ovid's texts, and the SEEK model becomes crucial for the discussion of the psychological motives behind what is found in the texts.

1.4   The method and structure of the dissertation

I have used these two theoretical backgrounds in various ways to facilitate my examination of Ovid's characters, which assuage his declining mental state. I am analysing Ovid's texts from a psychoanalytic literary criticism perspective in that I draw information about his unconscious from his own writing. This means that I read his texts for anything that could signify an unconscious mechanism or desire. Furthermore, I use the SEEK model to inform my discussion of the use of the techniques I have found that he uses to create the characters which influence him.

Before this main study, in Chapter 2, I use vertical reading to gather Ovid's biographical information, and I juxtapose his current situation in Tomis with his past, drawing inferences about his psychological state while in exile by comparing his self-depictions with the criteria for Major Depression Disorder as described in the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (5th edition). This lays the groundwork for the following discussions which rely on recognising his declining mental state. In the following two chapters, the main analysis of the texts takes place.[70] In Chapter 3, I examine the characters of the Comforting Muses and Books-as-Children. This is done, firstly, by delving into the literary background of the character, as well as the inspiration which prompted Ovid to use them. Emphasis is placed on the precursors to the *motifs* Ovid uses as there are many predecessors to Ovid in his technique of personification. This is followed by an analysis of how Ovid constructs these characters in his texts and their possible meanings to him. Chapter 4 examines Ovid's simultaneous depersonalisation and repersonification of himself and others into body parts, animals, objects, and concepts. His use of depersonalisation on its own, as well as depersonalisation and repersonification, are analysed for trends, but there is little information on precursors to this technique, so the focus is mainly on how and why he uses this technique. After this discussion, there is an examination of Ovid's oppressive characters, usually made through the use of depersonalisation and sometimes some repersonification, as well as the strong use of metaphor

---

[70]   This book is considered one of the most important diagnostic tools in the field of psychology and is used almost ubiquitously by psychologists and psychiatrists around the world to diagnose patients.

and metonymy. These complex characters tend to draw on prior motifs and depictions, so I begin with outlining their origins and inspiration before moving on to Ovid's interpretation and depiction of them in his texts. Throughout the discussion, possible internal and external reasons for Ovid's creation of the characters are posed, emphasising internal reasons and a reliance on the SEEK model of Anthropomorphism's tenets as the basis for the discussion. Chapter 5 wraps up the dissertation with final notes on my overall conclusions.

1.5   Current thinking around the topic

The idea that Ovid may have been expressing the trauma of his exile through rhetorical devices is not new. In 1990, J. M. Claassen wrote an article entitled "Ovid's Wavering Identity: Personification and Depersonalisation in the Exilic Poems". In this article, taken from Chapter 8, "Literary Mechanisms" of her 1986 doctoral dissertation, "*Poeta, Exsul, Vates*: A Stylistic and Literary Analysis of Ovid's *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto*", Claassen analyses how Ovid uses both personification and depersonalisation to cope with his psychological reaction to exile, showing the "wavering identity", a change in his depictions of selfhood of himself and other individuals in his writings.[71] According to Claassen, Ovid personifies non-humans, namely the hostile nature which conspires against him,[72] literature, and his abilities, for lack of desired human contact, and depersonalises himself by either depicting himself as non-human or identifying so strongly with his personifications, namely literature and his own mental powers,[73] or other non-humans, that his own sense of self is lost. This means that Ovid has undergone a process of depersonalisation through his identification with these non-humans.

The parallels to Claassen's supposition that can be found in psychological theory are a recent development. Therefore, Claassen never had the opportunity, or perhaps the interest, to pursue the implications of her supposition further as – while she does often engage in self-proclaimed "armchair" psychology[74] – she does not use psychological theories or tenets as tools in her

---

[71] This is a term taken from Hermann Fränkel's book, *Ovid: A Poet Between Two Worlds* (1945:73). However, he only uses the term a handful of times as the work is actually a chronological analysis of Ovid's life through his poetry, during which some instances of the identity of others being fluid and "wavering" can be seen, culminating in his exile and the "wavering" of Ovid's own identity as he loses his sense of self.

[72] Under this category, Claassen identifies youth, age, time, and seasons, which are personified in passing (for example, age is personified in *Tr.* 3.7.35, 36; 4.8.13. *Pont.* 1.4.2 and youth is personified in *Pont.* 1.10.12, Claassen 1990:105). One minor character who falls within this category which I have examined is Ovid's personified birthday (Claassen 1990:106). The other "characters", however, are neither comforting or oppressive, nor are they consistent conceits. Because of this, I have not analysed them within this dissertation. However, this avenue of the personification of more minor characters is worthy of further study.

[73] Claassen (1990:105).

[74] Claassen (2008:8).

discussion of Ovid, instead making valid personal insights and assumptions about his psychological state and motivations through a thorough reading of Ovid's literature.

As the Claassen article inspired this dissertation, the stated purpose of both pieces of academic literature is almost identical: to examine Ovid's use of personification and depersonalisation to convey his psychological reaction to exile.[75] Additionally, Claassen also takes chronology into account in an attempt to discern if there is any difference in Ovid's use of personification and depersonalisation through his years of exile.[76] However, this dissertation's scope and scale is quite different from that of Claassen's article, with Claassen referencing, in passing or with little in-depth inspection, the four characters that this study explores. Instead, she explores many more minor characters, such as the gods of sea and sky (*Tr*. 1.2) and the winds;[77] allegorical-type characters like those seen in the *Metamorphoses,*[78] such as *Fortuna*[79] and *Fama*;[80] and typical elegiac personifications of negative emotions, like sorrow or anger.[81] Some positive elegiac personifications are seen, such as glory or wish.[82] She also includes relatively little analysis of differing types of Ovidian depersonalisation. In contrast, this study uses a psychological theoretical background to substantiate its opinions regarding the psychological reasons for Ovid's decision to use personification and depersonalisation. Many other articles and books written by Claassen cover Ovid from various angles, especially his exile.[83] Most of

---

[75] Claassen (1990:103).

[76] Claassen later notes that there is no relative chronological structure to the fourth book of the *Epistulae ex Ponto* and that rather it shows a psychological retrogression (Claassen 1990:114).

[77] Claassen (1990:107-8). According to Claassen, the storm-poetry of *Tristia* 1.2, 4 and 11 intimately displays Ovid's view of the conspiracy of malevolent nature against him. Notably, both of these sets of personified characters are pre-existing personifications: personifications that Ovid drew upon for his poetry but did not create or expand upon himself.

[78] These characters are "Envy" (*Invidia*), "Hunger" (*Fames*), "Sleep" (*Somnus*) and "Fame" or "Rumour" (*Fama*). Personification in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* has been rather extensively covered when compared to his exilic personification. For further reading on personification in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, see scholars such as Miller (2004), and Lowe (2008). See especially Ovid's personifications of concepts such as Envy, Rumour, Hunger and Sleep in the *Metamorphoses*. For personifications of Rumour, see Zumwalt (1977), Rosati (2002 :297-9 *passim*), Tissol (2002 :307-10, 320, 335, *passim*), Williams (2009 :162-3 *passim*), Gladhill (2013), and Kelly (2014). See Hardie (2009) for an exploration of the personifications of both Fame and Envy in Ovid and others. See Shiaele (2010) for a relatively detailed exploration of Ovid's personification of Envy, Hunger, Sleep, and Rumour in the *Metamorphoses*.

[79] *Fortuna* is seen frequently in the exilic texts and is almost always depicted with a negative connotation, which is important as Ovid is essentially showing a negative outlook on his fortunes and fate (*Tr*. 1.5.34; 5.8.15. *Pont.* 2.3.51; 4.3.29-32, 9.121) (Claassen 1990:109).

[80] *Fama* is often identified with Ovid (e.g., *Pont*. 1.5.83-4; 3.1.47), and sometimes acts as a substitute for the friendly, daily interactions which Ovid is lacking (Claassen 1990:109).

[81] Claassen (1990:105).

[82] Claassen (1990:105).

[83] Claassen has published two books, *Displaced Persons: The Literature of Exile from Cicero to Boethius* and *Ovid Revisited: The Poet in Exile*, which are updated amalgams of some of her prior works. As such, the previous works contained in these books are not covered. These two books are the reason why my overview of her work is not chronological.

them are considered in this literature review to some extent, but some, which are repetitive, such as her 2009 chapter in which she thoroughly provides an overview of all her discussions related to the *Tristia*, will not be covered.[84]

Claassen's body of literature begins with an overview of Ovid, "Publius Ovidius Naso: His Life and Works", published in 1974, where she outlines his life and works in chronological order and urges scholars to take caution when attempting to draw hard facts from Ovid's autobiographical poetry.[85] She speaks of how Ovid soothed his woes through a steady output of poetry and highlights how he had not yet deserted his prior whimsicality.[86] Claassen's first mention of one of the main characters examined in this dissertation, the motif of a book or poem as a child, is seen in this work.[87] Claassen goes on to analyse Ovid's depictions of the location and inhabitants of his exile[88] and his own inevitable death.

In her book, *Displaced Persons: The Literature of Exile from Cicero to Boethius,* based to an extent on her doctoral degree along with three other articles she subsequently published,[89] she explores the differing emotional reactions of several ancient authors to exile,[90] namely Cicero, Ovid, Seneca the Younger, Dio Chrysostomus, and, the later Byzantine author, Boethius, from a third-,[91] second-, and first grammatical person narrative perspective.[92] While Claassen does examine the other exiles, especially Cicero, to a measurable degree, she focuses on Ovid more heavily than the others as his exilic texts provide a framework for understanding exile as a

---

[84] In her 2017 article, "The Exiled Ovid's Reception of Gallus", Claassen analyses the allusions Ovid makes to the "first exiled poet" of the Augustan regime, Gaius Cornelius Gallus. However, the remaining works of Gallus are so slight that only inferences can be made. Claassen further analyses textual similarities between Ovid and Gallus's works before concluding that Ovid, whether early or later, increasingly had Gallus in his mind throughout his exile. This may be relevant as Gallus committed suicide, meaning that Ovid could have been considering something similar.

[85] Claassen (1974:6). For other overviews of Ovid's life, see Fränkel (1945), Fredericks (1974), and Fairweather (1987).

[86] Claassen (1974:11, 15).

[87] Claassen (1974:12).

[88] Claassen (1974:13).

[89] Claassen (1991a; 1996a; 1996b).

[90] In the beginning of this book Claassen mentions a German source, Grasmück (1978), that has apparently treated Ovid's response to exile with some care, with both Claassen and Grasmück focusing on how Ovid, along with others, reworked their emotions regarding their exile into their works. Grasmück apparently stresses exile to be an illness for which the only cure is some form of sublimation (Claassen 1999:1). Claassen does not comment on this statement by Grasmück, but she probably included it as it is a statement to which she is possibly aligned as she mentions the similarities between their stances towards Ovid.

[91] Claassen pays less regard to her chapter on third-person narratives as they provide so little information on the emotional exposition of the exile (Claassen 1999:11).

[92] The first-person narrative involves a writer writing about an exile, the second-person narrative involves correspondence between someone in exile and those in Rome, and the third-person narrative involves an exile describing their own experience (Brunelle, 2001:84).

phenomenon,[93] referring to his tendency to mythologise his exilic experience,[94] his use of the "conversation with an absent friend" motif,[95] his juxtaposition of an idealised view of Rome in the past with a miserable Tomitian present,[96] and Ovid's epistolary poetry from before exile, the *Heroides*,[97] as a precursor to the persuasive letters to loved ones, "from beyond the grave",[98] seen in his exilic literature.[99]

The next monograph from Claassen was a 2008 eBook titled *Ovid Revisited: The Poet in Exile*. It is a reworked amalgam of thirteen of her prior articles, six reviews, and her doctoral degree.[100] The book begins with an examination of Ovid's autobiographical details and seminal work done in the field which cover Ovid's *error*, and an outline of the issues of approach in Ovidian studies, such as remaining cognizant of the fact that what the reader receives from Ovid is essentially a fabrication to some degree.[101] Claassen then discusses the importance of *variatio*[102] and chronology when studying Ovid's exilic literature, stressing that the order in which the reader receives Ovid's work is a fabrication. Claassen suggests, which I agree with, that Ovid's exilic poetry is diachronic, meaning that it deals with phenomena and changes over time rather than being the product of a long-term plan in the poet's mind.[103] Claassen then divides Ovid's exilic literature into five rough chronological phases, which serve as the basis of her diachronic approach.[104]

---

[93] This is a perspective that Claassen maintains in later works such as her 2003 article, "Living in a Place Called Exile: The Universals of the Alienation Caused by Isolation", where she analyses Ovid's exilic experience and compares it to the exilic experience of modern-day South African exiles.

[94] Through this mythologising, Ovid likens himself to mythical figures, becoming one, and telling a tale of epic proportions in which his situation is equated to the mythical tales of old. Ovid also equates Augustus with a god through this mythologising as a god typically oppresses an epic hero, and Ovid, our exilic hero, is oppressed by Augustus (Claassen 1999:68-72, 191).

[95] Claassen (1999:110).

[96] Claassen (1999:190-204).

[97] The *Heroides* is a book of letters written by famous ancient women from myths and stories to the male counterparts of their stories.

[98] Claassen (1990:131).

[99] Claassen (1999:110-1). However, Ovid seems to imply that these appeals never achieve a response from their recipients (Claassen 1990:129-30).

[100] Claassen (1986a; 1986b; 1987; 1988; 1989a; 1989b; 1990; 1991b; 1992; 1994; 1999a; 1999b; 2000; 2001; 2003a; 2003b; 2004a; 2004b; 2006; 2007). Some chapter titles or sub-titles coincide with these publications, but others are true amalgams of several works. However, as they are newer reworkings of older publications, these titles will not be covered again in this literature review.

[101] Claassen (2008:15-9).

[102] *Variatio* refers to: "[t]he action of making varied, diversification", "[d]ivergence of behaviour (between different people, etc.)", and "[m]ental fluctuation, change of mind" (*OLD* 2, s.v. "*uariatio*" 1a, b & c [Glare 2012]). It is highly likely that Claassen had all of these definitions in mind when writing this.

[103] This diachrony does not mean that the overall structure of the exilic texts is to be ignored or that it would be futile to try and date individual poems as such distinctions, if ever truly uncovered, will provide a definite advantage (Claassen 2008:21).

[104] Phase 1 (December, 9 CE to about March, 10 CE), Phase 2 (March, 10 CE to about February, 12 CE), Phase 3 (March, 12 CE to about January, 13 CE), Phase 4 (October, 12 CE to about December, 13 CE), and Phase 5

The book has no overarching theme other than the fact that it is all about Ovid's exilic experience. Claassen writes of Ovid's relationship with, and speaking to and about, Augustus and the imperial family while in exile and his tonal variations in the exilic texts, emphasising the individual components of the poems she is analysing. She provides an analysis of what he has to say about his own work, his conveyance of emotion through metre, and his "sound painting", whereby he uses certain literary devices to paint images with sounds and focuses on the vocabulary of exile, his use of typical elegiac language to describe the isolation and loneliness he feels, along with political and legal jargon. In addition, emphasis is placed on Ovid's literary and acoustic punning and use of the *double entendre*, placement, repetition, juxtaposing, and contrast of words as another way to convey meaning. Claassen also highlights Ovid's use of myth in his exilic texts, his use of mythical figures in both an ornamental and functional way, and his mythologising of his own exilic experience.[105] The book concludes by examining Ovid's similarities to and influence on modern-day South African exiles and his influence on modern scholars and artists.

In her 2013 article, "Words with Pictures: Visualizing with Ovid", Claassen analyses the three modes of "seeing" that Ovid portrays through words and verbiage relating to sight.[106] In this article, Claassen examines the variety of ways in which Ovid refers to or uses seeing or perception and sight in his poetry both before and after being exiled.

In her 2016 article, "Seizing the *Zeitgeist*: Ovid in Exile and Augustan Political Discourse", Claassen analyses Ovid's exilic texts as they relate to his relationship with Augustus, specifically in how Ovid appropriated some of Augustus's own talking points and propaganda, seemingly to use both to his own ends and against Augustus.[107] Most of the article involves discussions on how Ovid used Augustan or imperial discourse for his own purposes, but Claassen ends her discussion with a section on the identification of Augustus with the god

---

(January, 14 CE until Ovid's death). Phase 1 contains *Tristia* 1 and 2, Phase 2 contains *Tristia* 3 and 4, Phase 3 contains *Tristia* 5 (and possibly parts of *Epistulae ex Ponto* 4), Phase 4 contains *Epistulae ex Ponto* 1-3, and Phase 5 contains *Epistulae ex Ponto* 4 (Claassen, 2008:21-2).

[105] This refers to Ovid's mythologising of his exile, where Ovid, a mythical figure, is supported by a god, his Muse, and survives in a place of death and woe. He compares himself positively to characters such as Orpheus, Jason, Odysseus, Hercules, Theseus, and Aeneas. However, Ovid is always depicted as enduring harsher situations than them and yet somehow still surviving and remaining loyal to his wife (Claassen, 2008:160).

[106] In the *Metamorphoses*, the reader watches as his various protagonists are seeing or being seen; in the *Amores* 3.2 and *Ars Amatoria* 1.135ff, the reader becomes the protagonist by looking at his mistress during a "day at the races"; and in the exilic poems Ovid is the sole viewer of the origin of his *error*, the event which he neglected to report. While in exile Ovid mentally "sees" Rome and the reader "sees" him being comforted by his inner visions of it.

[107] Another source which covers Ovid and Augustan discourse is Barchiesi (1997).

Jupiter. Claassen highlights Ovid's deific treatment of Augustus, reiterating her stance on Ovid's subversive nature towards Augustus, with him "poking fun at" Augustus's supposed divinity in subtle ways.[108]

Claassen takes a strong stylistic and structural approach to Ovid, employing statistics to analyse his texts in great depth and breadth. She sometimes touches upon the psychological aspects of Ovid's poetry and makes important points but does not use psychological theories as her approach takes a strong literary stance.[109] This study has gone further by including a psychological theoretical background to analyse Ovid with the intention of providing additional insights to that of Claassen on Ovid's exilic personification and depersonalisation, focusing more on the personal, internal[110] reasons for his use of these techniques rather than his external reasons.[111] Furthermore, apart from Claassen's various publications, which introduced the discussion of Ovid's depersonalisation to the academic sphere for the first time,[112] there seems to have been no other attempt by English scholars to explore depersonalisation in Ovid's exilic texts of either the self or the other.

Other influential authors in Ovidian exilic studies are Nagle (1980) and Williams (1994). Nagle (1980) examines Ovid's use of subject and genre in his exilic texts, to whom they are addressed, and why. She then examines the degree to which Ovid was successful in his appeals. She emphasizes Ovid's use of pre-existing motifs, language style and *topoi* throughout the book, highlighting precursors and predecessors to Ovid's techniques regularly. Without using the word, Nagle also seems to believe that Ovid is depersonalising himself into his poetry so that he can live vicariously in Rome through it.

---

[108] Here, Claassen includes a noteworthy point that Ovid's depictions of Augustus as a god could have influenced the way the West viewed him, strengthening his link to the gods in a way that might not have happened to the degree it did without Ovid's interference.

[109] Additionally, Claassen has continuously stressed the various Ovidian *personae* which Ovidian scholars encounter, emphasising their differences and sometimes discussing how these *personae* interplay, but I believe that this view of Ovid as different *personae* might be hindering more than helpful as it divorces the scholar of trains of thought that provide further avenues of study, such as my own, which involve the analysis of a combination of two or more of Claassen's *personae* as one being. I believe that inferences about "Ovid the man" can be drawn due to the psychological nature of his exilic texts and I do not believe that this *persona* is entirely fictional, as Claassen seems to suggest (Claassen, 2008:58).

[110] By "internal reasons", I am referring to the unconscious motives Ovid might have had for engaging in the use of these techniques. These reasons are internal and personal to him and have no real external implications or consequences.

[111] By "external reasons", I am referring to Ovid's goal of recall and his communication with loved ones, friends and readers.

[112] Claassen (1986b:183-9).

Nagle identifies and briefly analyses the roots of the book-as-child motif and the true purpose of Ovid's use of the motif. However, she does not focus on the personal function of this motif. Apart from this, she also does not note the influence of Ovid's muse on his life in exile, his close association of Augustus with the god Jupiter or his personification of the natural landscape of Pontus and the simultaneous depersonalisation of its inhabitants. This is likely because these topics fell out of the scope of her discussion as she tended to focus on the more external aspects of Ovid's exilic literature. Nagle has also not taken a psychological approach to Ovid, choosing to analyse him from a stylistic, subjective, and structural approach.

Williams's (1994) *Banished Voices: Readings in Ovid's Exile Poetry*[113] provides a very different perspective on Ovid's exilic voice than that of either me or Claassen in that he focuses on Ovid's exilic dissimilatory techniques without regarding his psychology or use and creation of characters. Williams emphasises that there is no historical fact in what Ovid wrote while in exile other than the friendship he portrays with those to whom he writes his letters. This is not to say that Williams believed that Ovid was never exiled; rather, he is a proponent of the idea that Ovid was only writing from the perspective of someone who has lost everything. Williams argues that Ovid constructs *his* Tomis and Tomitans through the influence of, and adherence to, literary models of earlier poets such as Vergil but subverts these by changing the depictions from what they were. Similarly, Ovid constructs his "poetic decline" not only to garner sympathy but also to follow pre-established *topoi* of denigrating one's works or skill,[114] but he does so to a different end than his predecessors. Williams analyses Ovid's treatment of Augustus in *Tristia* 2, claiming that Augustus would not have understood Ovid's dissimilatory techniques and would have likely taken Ovid's adulation of him as fact, allowing Ovid to be playfully ambiguous and, subtextually, irreverent towards him.[115] According to Williams's supposition, Ovid could easily construct characters like the Augustus-Jupiter character with little fear of retribution.

While Ovid's depersonalisation has not interested many scholars, Ovid's use of personification in his literary works has been subject to academic scrutiny for many years.[116] Some scholars

---

[113] This book is a reworking of his Cambridge dissertation.

[114] Ovid apparently made use of this *topos* through poems, or moments in his poetry, that are influenced by Catullus, Propertius, Callimachus and Horace.

[115] Here, Williams points to the fact that Augustus horribly misunderstood the *Ars*, claiming that Augustus would not have been able to appreciate Ovid's style and was prone to taking poetry literally.

[116] Examples are seen in Segal (1969); Davisson (1984); Claassen (1990); Gentilcore (1995); Newlands (1997); Hinds (2002); Geyssen (2007); Berstein (2011). See Hinds (1985) for a discussion of when Ovid's *Tristia* 1 meets its brethren in Rome. Hinds, too, covers Ovid's personification of his works, but only in passing as part of a larger discussion on Ovid's past and present works. Mordine (2010) analyses Ovid's personification of

apart from Claassen have identified some of Ovid's characters and explored them in different ways. The most commonly identified character is the book-as-child character seen in Chapter 3. In addition to Nagle's brief analysis,[117] other scholars such as Davisson (1984), Williams (1992), Newlands (1997), and Geyssen (2007) have also examined Ovid's personification of his book. Davisson (1984) focuses on Ovid's father-child relationship with his books, tracking its growth and development chronologically, noting the similarities but highlighting the differences between Horace's *Epistles* 1.20 and Ovid's use of the motif through an examination of several individual poems. Davisson asserts that Ovid uses this book-as-child motif to express mixed emotions about his works, the *Ars* and the *Metamorphoses*, and his own guilt.[118] Williams (1992) analyses the various representations of the book-roll in Latin poetry from Catullus to Cinna and Horace. He also covers Ovid's depiction of his "little book" in *Tristia* 1.1.3-14, emphasising its proclaimed poor appearance and sad, imperfect contents as indicative of Ovid's exilic situation with the implication that if he were recalled or relocated, the quality of his poetry would improve.[119] Newlands (1997) analyses the role of Ovid's personified book in *Tristia* 3.1.[120] She concludes that Ovid's *Tristia* 3.1 is a testament to Ovid's anxieties that his poetry will lose its significance and be forgotten now that it has been separated from the rich cultural context of Rome. Geyssen (2007) focuses on Ovid's relationship between himself and his book in *Tristia* 1.1 and how he intends to use this relationship, and the book-as-child

---

the book in passing, noting its appearance, while also examining the relationship between Ovid, his book and the reader of *Tr.* 1.1.

[117] Nagle (1980:82-90). In the same chapter, "Why: Aims and Addresses", she also writes of Ovid's travelling back to Rome in his mind's eye and through his identification with his poems (Nagle 1980:90-100). She then speaks of Ovid's self-consolation through writing poetry (Nagle 1980:101-7). This book is a good starting place for the reasons and methods for Ovid's exile literature, as Nagle provides a detailed outline of Ovid's choice of subject and genre; his addressees and aims in writing to or about them; and the supposed effect of exile on Ovid's talent and all the Horatian influences this denigration of the self implies; however, Nagle fails to seek any meaningful psychological context or focus heavily on Ovid's use of personification or depersonalisation.

[118] Davisson notes that the poet-parent comparison is relatively infrequent in the *Epistulae ex Ponto*, commenting that, in general, Ovid is less whimsical than before and then discusses Ovid's depictions of his poems in the *Epistulae*, usually commenting on their quality before concluding that Ovid's book-as-child motif serves to express tensions between involvement and detachment between Ovid and his poetry. Ovid regrets the unintended effects of the *Ars* and recognizes the imperfections of the *Metamorphoses* and the exilic literature; however, he continues to include explicit references to himself as the creator, through which he pleads whimsically for his readers to look kindly on his orphans.

[119] See Hendren (2013) for a discussion on the self-proclaimed quality of Ovid's works.

[120] A poem in which Ovid travels vicariously with his book, which is personified into a somewhat fearful provincial traveller who marvels at the sites of Augustan Rome (Newlands 1997:57). In this poem the book itself is the ostensible speaker unlike its two predecessors, Horace's *Epistles* 1.20 and Ovid's own *Tristia* 1.1, which both involve the book being spoken to by the poet as the poet's slave or child, respectively. This method of having the book be the ostensible speaker was unique to Ovid at the time and Newlands notes that this method is of importance because it allows Ovid to essentially remark on topics he otherwise would be unable to address if he were speaking directly (Newlands 1997:58).

he uses, to convince the reader he deserves a recall to Rome.[121] Both Williams and Newlands examine Ovid's depiction of his book as shabby and unkempt, a symbol of his situation and circumstances, and each of the scholars note similarities and differences between Ovid's book-as-child from various books of the *Tristia* and the master-slave dynamic presented in Ovid's predecessor in this technique, identified by Nagle as Horace's *Epistles* 1.20. Despite thorough discussions of the subject, none of the authors have considered the possible psychological motives Ovid might have personally had to create this character or the personal functions it fulfils for him.

Numerous works have examined various aspects of Ovidian literature that are used to create characters. Some scholars follow the alignment between Augustus and the god Jupiter but the Augustus-Jupiter character itself is only really seen in the works of Claassen (esp. 1987) and then only briefly.[122] In one chapter on "God and Man: Caesar Augustus in Ovid's Exilic Mythology", McGowan (2009) focuses on how Ovid turns Augustus into a god by aligning him strongly with Jupiter while also highlighting Augustus as a god in his own right as a Caesar destined for deification.[123] The other aspects of Ovid's exile, such as Pontus and the locals, which Ovid changes to create the Pontus as a Physical Oppressor character, are frequently seen in scholarly literature.[124] However, these aspects are rarely spoken of as characters by scholars.

Ovid's mental health also received some scholarly attention over the years by scholars such as Richmond (1995) and Williams (1996) and especially by Fulkerson (2023), who dedicates most of their article to the analysis of Ovid's physical and mental state during exile.[125]

Richmond (1995) speaks in passing on Ovid's physical and mental health, noting his decline in physical health beginning in the second poem of the third book of the *Tristia*. Richmond highlights Ovid's belief that his mental illness is affecting his physical body before continuing

---

[121] Geyssen cites both Horace and Catullus as predecessors of Ovid in the vein of a writer addressing a book (Geyssen, 2007:374).

[122] Ward (1933) offers a study on the associations of Augustus with Jupiter across various classical poets.

[123] McGowan (2009) is an excellent source on emperor worship in Ovid. According to McGowan, Kenney (1982) points out that Augustus is equated to Jupiter in thirty of the fifty poems of the Tristia (Kenney 1982:444). For emperor worship in Ovid, see Scott (1930). For further insight into the worship of the emperor in Rome and Roman religion as a whole, see Gradel (2002). For an examination of Ovid's didactics towards Augustus in *Tr.* 2, see Davis (1999) and Gibson (1999). See Wiedemann (1975) for an examination of the political background of *Tr.* 2.

[124] For an examination of Ovid's depictions of Pontus, see Evans (1975) and Batty (1994). For a discussion on Ovid and language in exile, see Stevens (2009). Of equal importance is Ovid's depiction of Rome. For a discussion of this and the contrast between his depictions of Pontus, see Reitz (2013) and Philbrook (2016).

[125] For an analysis of themes of death in Ovid's exilic poetry, see Ingleheart (2015) and Galasso (2023). For an argument on why Ovid associated his exile with a living death, see Grebe (2010).

to Ovid's mental health.[126] He only very briefly describes the fluctuation of Ovid's mental state.

A far more lengthy and focused view of Ovid's mental and physical health across his works is provided by Fulkerson (2023), who makes an in-depth exploration of Ovid's physical health and his depiction of his health as it relates to the common theme of love being depicted as an illness in elegy. She takes the stance that Ovid's mental and physical health are intrinsically linked in how he relates them to his reader and possibly in his own mind. Fulkerson notes that it has been suggested that Ovid may have had bipolar disease, possibly stemming from Williams's (1996) beliefs about the *Ibis*, which Williams believes to be evidence of mania. When mania is accompanied by the depression shown in the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto*, it points towards Ovid possibly having bipolar disease.[127]

These psychological approaches to Ovid provide great insight into his declining mental and physical state and his use of elegiac conventions to express the illness caused by exile, both physical and mental, but they fail to examine how Ovid attempts to alleviate this illness apart from his continuous output of poetry. While their approach to his illness has been bordering on the psychological, their analysis of his coping methods has not had a psychologically geared perspective, as this dissertation has.

A literary stance looking towards the psychological is seen in Francis (2023), who focuses on the expressions of psychological depersonalisation within creative writing.[128] He identifies three techniques used to create or convey depersonalisation: "showing-not-telling", image-based poetry and estranging techniques, and the hero's journey. However, Francis views these techniques and pathological depersonalisation as being linked through the damage done to our sense of community through the process of industrial and post-industrial capitalism, making applying his theories to Ovid difficult.

An attempt at deducing the semiotics of exile in more modern exilic literature, particularly in postmodern literature, was made by Zeng (2010). However, he focuses not only on expatriates[129] but also on those who become exiles in their own countries due to the changes in

---

[126] Richmond (1995:108).
[127] Williams (1996:112-33).
[128] Although he believes that the usefulness of searching through texts for evidence pointing to an author's psychopathology is limited at best and would be especially futile if the suppression of emotion seen to point towards depersonalisation was the work of the editor, for example (Francis, 2023:119).
[129] E.g., Peter Handke, James Joyce, Gu Cjeng, and Alfred Byron.

history,[130] those who are exiles in their poetic experience,[131] those who are exiles from their genre,[132] those who write about cosmic exile in time,[133] and female writers who experience a form of self-exile in the female experience.[134] This broad category of what is considered an exile leads to a relatively subjective approach towards each writer whose literature is explored with no overarching set of semiotics being identified as ubiquitous across "exile", only themes which each writer may or may not show the characteristics of such as disjointedness within signification, self-hood, narrative, time, and genre. Disjointedness in selfhood can be read as a kind of depersonalisation. However, the postmodernist perspective of this book renders most of the conclusions inapplicable to Ovid as he was living centuries before postmodernism.

1.6 Issues concerning the analysis of the primary sources

Through my analysis of modern scholarship, I have encountered issues surrounding Ovid's exilic texts, which must be addressed. The two fundamental issues surrounding the analysis of Ovid's exilic texts are whether or not one can ever discuss Ovid the human man by reading Ovid the poet's works and whether or not Ovid was even exiled at all.[135]

The first issue stems from the fact that a line has been drawn between Ovid the poet, and Ovid the man, separating the two. Throughout her works, from her doctoral degree up until the present day, Claassen has been a staunch proponent of there being more than one Ovidian persona, identifying a minimum of three in her various works: *poeta*, the poet who fell under Augustus's wrath; *exsul*, a suffering exile who just so happened to be a poet; and *vates*, a "speaker of divine truth", who tells the story of the emotional life of the *exsul* while fudging the reality of both the *exsul* and the *poeta*.[136]

In her 1990 article, she identifies a pre-exilic Ovidian persona, "the lover", who is present in the *Amores* and whom she identifies as distinct from Ovid, the man. This is likely because Ovid was adamant that his elegiac poetry was not a reflection of his life (*Tr*. 3.2.5-6), signifying that

---

[130] E.g., Wang Anyi, and Hai Zi.
[131] E.g., Emily Dickinson, and Sylvia Plath.
[132] E.g., Byron, and E. T. A. Hoffmann.
[133] E.g., Marcel Proust, and Jorge Luis Borges.
[134] E.g. Marguerite Duras, Maria Luisa Bombal, and Tomi Morrison.
[135] There is a third, minor, minor issue regarding the facetious nature of Ovid's works. Ovid's works were clearly meant for wider readership as he makes appeals to his readers (e.g. *Tr*. 2, which is clearly meant to be read by Augustus, and 3.1, in which Ovid indirectly speaks to his readers; Claassen 1999:12). If this is the case, why are some of them written as letters? It is possible that Ovid was attempting to create a sense of intimacy between himself and the named recipients of his letters, while also having other readers in mind as these letters typically contain attempts at persuasion to help him with his goal of recall.
[136] Claassen (1999:31).

the narrator of the elegiac poetry Ovid wrote before his exile is not meant to be Ovid himself but rather either a different version of him or another individual entirely. In this same article, she essentially distinguishes between the *vates*, who records the moods and thoughts of the *exsul*. This is similar to her distinction between "the lover" and "Ovid" in the *Amores*. It is an important distinction to make as it is possible that Ovid was writing his exilic texts in a similar way to his elegies or his *Metamorphoses*, where the poet is somewhat divorced of the content he writes as Ovid the man is not the one "saying" what the reader reads but rather Ovid the poet.

Regarding his exile poetry, I am afraid I have to disagree with this notion of Ovid being divorced from his exilic poetry, as Ovid's exilic poetry is far more personal than his other works. It is posed as letters and poems to friends and loved ones in Rome, his only communication with them. There are constant pleas to these individuals to help him and expressions of true distress. I believe that, while he could have tried to divorce himself from his exilic poetry, he ultimately could not fully do so due to the intimate nature of it. It is this view of Ovid as the writer and possible narrator of his exilic poetry that makes a psychological analysis or any psychological conclusions possible as Ovid the exiled poet and Ovid the suffering man waver between each other constantly under the mental stress of exile.

The second issue is whether Ovid was exiled at all and, if he was, whether he was exiled to Tomis.[137] This doubt was apparently first proposed by Hartman, and it has seen some attention over the years.[138] An often-cited reason for Ovid's exile being fictitious is that there are no accounts which refer to Ovid's exile apart from the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto*.[139] There are, however, references to Ovid being in the area, but they do not directly refer to Ovid as being exiled there.[140] Moreover, according to Claassen, internal evidence suggests that Ovid died in about 17 CE and was buried in Tomis. However, no surviving contemporary Roman sources speak of Ovid's death. Other sources from Ancient Rome are equally silent about

---

[137] Claassen (2008:197).

[138] See Hartman (1904-5) for the beginning of this idea. Hartman first proposed that Ovid's *carmen* was too weak a reason for exile and that Ovid must have not known the reason for his exile (Hartman 1904-5:114-24), before moving on to the idea that Ovid's Getic poems about Augustus were just rhetorical emperor worship (Hartman 1912), before eventually concluding in a meeting of the Leiden Classics Society that the entire exile to Tomis was fictitious (van der Velden 2019:338). Later proponents of Ovid's exile being fictitious are Fitton Brown (1985:19-22), Hofman (1987) and, much later, Fontaine (2019).

[139] Claassen (1986a:2).

[140] These sources are Pliny the Elder's *Natural History* 32.54 where he comments that Ovid had written about fish close to the end of his life on the shores of the Euxine (Plin. *Nat Hist.* 32.54; Bostock, J. & Riley, H. T. [trans., 1855-7]) and Statius's *Silvae* 1.2.254-5 which states that Ovid was joyful though he was in gloomy Tomis (Stat. *Silv.* 1.2.254-5; Slater, D. A. [trans., 1908]).

Ovid's relegation. This has led to much controversy surrounding the truth of Ovid's banishment.[141]

Additionally, scholars point to Ovid's fantastical and factually inaccurate depictions of Pontus and its inhabitants. However, Claassen notes that Ovid's depictions of Pontus and its inhabitants are intentionally fantastical,[142] a way to garner sympathy. But many scholars in history have taken what Claassen calls a historicistic approach, whereby Ovid's words are taken for fact, and Pontus is believed to have been under a perennial blanket of snow and ice.[143] However, the truth becomes clear when one compares archaeological evidence to Ovid's accounts of the locals. There is archaeological evidence of Tomis having strong Milesian connections with a flourishing Greek community, interspersed with more Romans than Ovid would want to admit and an advanced Thracian culture.[144] However, Claassen states that the modern approach to Ovidian studies is to view his approach to truth as Aristotelian in that he depicts potentiality rather than reality itself.[145]

Another stance is taken by Janssen (1951), who believes that Ovid's *Ars* was published too distantly from his exile to have elicited such a heavy punishment, and his *error* was too vaguely described by Ovid to be factual. Janssen also points towards the impossibility of finding a single political theory that would fit the reason for Ovid's exile.[146] Janssen believes Ovid's exile to be a metaphor for his failing poetic powers.[147]

I agree with Claassen's dismissal of this theory of Ovid never having been exiled or exiled to Tomis for several reasons. Ovid shows a far different understanding of the peoples living in and around the area at the time than his predecessors and contemporaries,[148] listing various poorly known tribes in his exilic texts and depicting those he came into contact with, especially the Scythians, in ways that went contrary to the accepted stereotypes that he would have been familiar with while living in Rome.

---

[141] Claassen (2008:197).
[142] Claassen (1999:190).
[143] Claassen (2008:15)
[144] Claassen (2008:15-6).
[145] Claassen (2008:16).
[146] Claassen (2008:197).
[147] Claassen (2008:197).
[148] See Batty (1994) for a well-rounded examination of the similarities and differences between the major tribes of the Danube area in Ovid's contemporaries' works and a comparison of how Ovid treated them in his exilic texts.

Ovid also shows an understanding of the astrology of Tomis, recounting which stars he could see from Tomis and how they are not seen as clearly in Rome.[149] While it is certainly possible that he might have acquired star maps or something similar, if he had, the dates would have been a year or so behind, as it would have taken time for those accounts to reach Rome.

Additionally, if Ovid were not actually exiled, it would have taken a significant amount of dedication to the façade to consistently and gradually show a false decrease in his mental and physical health over roughly a decade, refusing to write anything other than the (arguably monotonous) three known exilic texts. What would his reason for this be? How could he have known what the symptoms of isolation and depression were without having experienced them? His exilic texts show a definitive tonal shift that seems uncharacteristic and almost impossibly out of place when one assumes that his exile was fictional.

---

[149] See passages such as *Tr.* 3.4.47, 10.11, 11.8; 5.3.7, 5.39-40, and *Pont.* 1.5.73-4 for examples of how Ovid orients himself using the Bear constellations which are higher in the sky in Tomis than in Rome.

Chapter 2: Ovid's mental state

Perhaps the most pressing issue to be addressed for this study is not one of analysis of the texts but of recognising Ovid's mental state. There are few sources that provide evidence of Ovid's life apart from accounts given by Ovid himself. Throughout his exilic texts, he inserts small pieces of his personal history of his life in Rome, which can be easily compared to his descriptions of his life in Tomis to create an understanding of how different his life was in his place of exile and how this might have affected his mental health. Scholars such as Lawrence[150] have taken cultural approaches to psychoanalytic theory. Lawrence focused on the historical dimension of literature, examining the distortions which can be produced by a culture on the psyche of authors belonging to that culture.[151] This view of an author being altered by their culture is a significant concept to hold in one's mind while reading Ovid. His Roman culture undoubtedly influenced Ovid, which would have made his transition and life in Tomis particularly difficult as it was so different to Rome. To fully understand the shift and isolation that Ovid experienced when he was exiled, his biographical information must be analysed to create a comparison between Ovid's Rome and Ovid's Tomis.

2.1   Ovid's life: Rome versus Tomis

Most of the biographical information on Ovid comes from *Tristia* 4.10, an autobiography in three parts. In *Tristia* 4.10, Ovid gives an account of his life. This section has been recognised widely as the most complete source of Ovid's life, with it being considered by some as more a source of biographical information than a poem.[152] However, it is necessary to remember that this is actually an autobiography written as a poem, compiled into a larger work of poetry and that the contents and style may have been heavily influenced and edited to match Ovid's other poems in the work,[153] the genre of elegy itself, as well as to create an image of the poet that he

---

[150] Lawrence (1962) & Lawrence (1977).
[151] Wright ([1984] 2005:69).
[152] Fairweather (1987:181).
[153] Fairweather argues that *Tristia* 4.10 belongs to the ancient tradition of *sphragis* poems because it is the final poem of book four and has the characteristics of these kinds of poems. *Sphragis* poems, also known as seal or signet poems, are poems that make use of the literary device by the same name. The poet names or otherwise identifies themselves, especially at the beginning or end of a collection of poems as a form of signature (*OCD* 4, s.v. "*sphragis*" [Hornblower et al.]). Examples of this kind of poem are seen in Nicander's *Theriaca* (Nic. *Ther.* 957-8), Vergil's *Georgics* (Verg. *G.* 4.563-6), Horace's *Odes* (Hor. *Carm.* 3.30), and Ovid's own *Amores* (Ov. *Am.* 3.15). The only difference between *Tristia* 4.10 and the others listed here is that Ovid's *sphragis* in his *Tristia* is significantly longer than the others mentioned. While *Tristia* 4.10 definitely meets the criteria for a *sphragis* poem, Fredericks reminds the reader that by viewing *Tristia* 4.10 as the *sphragis* of the *Tristia* or any other number of his works and focusing solely on the biographical details of the piece, takes the focus

wanted to portray, instead of an accurate depiction of the man himself.[154]

According to Ovid, he was born on the 20th of March 43 BCE in Sulmo, Italy (*Tr.* 4.10.3. *Pont.* 4.14.49), to an equestrian family (Ov. *Am.* 1.3.8; *Tr.* 2.542; 4.2.16, 10.3-4).[155] Ovid says that his house used to be humble yet distinguished and inferior to none (*Tr.* 2.111), that it was neither very wealthy nor very poor and that its knights were not conspicuous (*Tr.* 2.113-4) and was proud that status came from an ancient line and that they were not granted status as knights through warfare or other means (Ov. *Am.* 3.15.5-6; *Tr.* 4.10.7-8; *Pont.* 4.8.17-8). His pride in gaining his status passively could have come from his desire to live outside the public sphere. There also seem to be several different camps within the equestrian order, those who received their horses and the means to maintain them from the state and those recorded by Livy, who writes that equestrians started volunteering to serve with their own horses during the siege of Veii (Liv. 5.7) and were paid three-fold that of infantry for their service (Liv. 5.12). It is possible that some of the older order of equestrians looked down on the newer class, but this is unconfirmed.

Additionally, any citizen of free descent with property valued at over one hundred thousand denarii could be considered a part of the equestrian class. However, only a few thousand were hand-picked and confirmed by the emperor. According to Jones, many administrative positions were filled by this group. As such, Ovid is precise in mentioning that Augustus supplied him with his horse (*Tr.* 2.90). This could signify his pride at being a part of the more legitimate type of equestrian, which the emperor had chosen through the formal bestowing of a horse. From these "confirmed" equestrians, the emperor chose individuals for participation in many positions, such as officers of middle grade, tribunes of legions, prefects of auxiliary units and higher officials except provincial governors.[156] Due to his equestrian status, Ovid would have been used to a more luxurious life of higher status in society than the one he would be afforded in Tomis, as his status in Tomis would be that of *relegatus* and not *exsul*. This means that his status as a Roman citizen had not been taken from him, nor would his property in Rome be

---

away from the piece's function as the creative epilogue of the book (Fredericks 1974:140). Ovid's self-depiction in 4.10 shows what he would want the reader to think of him as well as how he thought of himself, namely, as a free-spirited man, concerned with an easier "life in the shade", who was consumed with a passion for poetry from a young age.

[154] This idea is laid out and covered in detail in Fredericks (1974).

[155] The equestrian class was a class of knights which fell between the Senate and the Plebeians which, under Augustus, any freedman could join after submitting to a property qualification of four-hundred-thousand sesterces (one hundred thousand denarii) (*OLD,* s.v. "*Equester*" 3a).

[156] Jones (1964:8).

affected by his banishment. However, he could not return home to enjoy these luxuries unless recalled by the emperor.

Additionally, this banishment was particularly harsh on Ovid because he could not leave Tomis as he was ordered to remain there.[157] It is unsure whether his equestrian status truly meant anything while he was in exile as he could not participate in any equestrian roles in Rome, if he had wanted to, or enjoy any of the Rome-based luxuries that other equestrians could enjoy. In addition to this, Ovid does, at one point, imply that he had to leave his wealth in Rome (*Tr.* 1.6.15), so he could not benefit from this either.

In his youth, Ovid had an older brother who was deeply passionate about oratory (*Tr.* 4.10.17), and with whom Ovid was very close. This brother died when he was twenty-one (*Tr.* 4.10.9-11).[158] Their father decided to begin their education early, sending them to Rome to study the liberal arts after Ovid had completed his education in grammar, syntax and rhetoric (*Tr.* 4.10.15-6; Sen. *Controv.* 2.8 and 9.5.17) [159] under Arellius Fuscus and Porcinus Latro.[160] Due to this, it can be assumed that Ovid was highly educated and used to interacting with similarly educated people. This milieu would have differed dramatically from the "savage Getae" Ovid was sent to live with during his exile (*Tr.* 5.3.8; *Pont.* 1.7.2, 3.9.32, 4.8.84, 4.15.40).

At the time of his education in Rome, Ovid was starting to make his mark on Messalla's poetic circle before earning his *toga virilis* (*Tr.* 4.10.19-30; *Ep*, 2.3.75-80).[161] Ovid had always felt drawn to poetry (*Tr.* 4.10.20), claiming that poems would spring from his hands and that everything he wrote would become verse (*Tr.* 4.10.25-6). Ovid's father did not approve of Ovid's love of poetry (*Tr.* 4.10.21-2) and later only agreed to allow him to continue after the success of Ovid's *Amores*.[162] After his father's disapproval, Ovid tried to devote himself to the liberal arts but struggled (*Tr.* 4.10.22-4). He and his brother finally finished their education and took on the *toga virilis* of manhood; however, each was still obsessed with the passion of his youth when, at the age of twenty, Ovid's brother suddenly died, a devastating loss that Ovid

---

[157] Wheeler ([1924] 1988:xviii).

[158] Wheeler disagrees with this, stating that Ovid's brother died in 24 BCE while he was twenty (Wheeler [1924] 1988:xvi).

[159] While very close, Ovid and his brother had very different talents and interests. His brother was well-suited to the life of a barrister as he was born with the gift of eloquence and a natural predisposition to the "clash of words in a public court" (*Tr.* 4.10.17-8).

[160] Wheeler ([1924] 1988:ix).

[161] The *toga virilis* was a simple white toga that signified the wearer as a male adult Roman citizen who enjoyed all the privileges of holding such a position in society (Edmondson 2008:26).

[162] Green (2005:xxx).

never truly recovered from (*Tr.* 4.10.28-32). Ovid's father was set on him taking on an official career which could eventually lead to the Senate, and Ovid was confirmed as an *eques* in anticipation of this career (*Tr.* 2.90).[163] However, he decided against this before starting the *cursus honorum*, known colloquially as the ladder of offices. He travelled for 18 months with fellow poet Macer,[164] instead.[165] While this period of travelling indicates Ovid's willingness or ability to be away from Rome, the fact that he travelled to places where he could learn suggests that the presence of knowledge and art made the new destinations attractive and tolerable to Ovid. Ovid's descriptions of Tomis do not suggest a knowledge base, such as a library or public reading circle, in which he could participate.

Upon his arrival home, after his 18 months of travel, Ovid began his poetic career in earnest, giving recitations and publishing his *Amores*. Ovid decided to "narrow his purple stripe" due to having neither the endurance nor inclination to enter the political field as he yearned for the life of leisure that came with poetry. This "purple stripe" on his tunic is the *clavus*,[166] a purple stripe on the tunic which was broad for senators and narrow for equestrians. However, in the time of the emperors, the sons of the senators and equestrians preparing for civil office also wore the broad stripe.[167] Ovid's decision to "narrow" his "stripe" most likely refers to his decision to step away from the political life his father had hoped for him.[168] Ovid then left for Rome and was taken up by Messalla Corvinus as a promising literary beginner (*Tr*. 4.10.35-40). Ovid came into contact with many poets and would have been in close contact with many like-minded individuals who would provide him with support and critique regarding his works. The luxury of counsel and a vast amount of reading materials would not be afforded to him in Tomis as the population, in Ovid's words, barely spoke Latin and had no great supply of books (*Tr*. 3.14.37-40). Ovid seems to seek an audience so strongly that he claims to have composed poems in Getic while at Tomis (*Pont.* 4.13.19).

---

[163] It would seem that this confirmation took place through the bestowing of an *equus publicus* to Ovid by the emperor (Jones 1964:8). According to Green, certain equestrian members, the *equites equo publico*, were granted a horse at the expense of the state to mark a special honour. Augustus maintained an annual "ride-past", *equitum transecutio*, which Ovid remembers having taken part in in *Tristia* 2.90 (Green 2005:224).

[164] Claassen (1986a:1).

[165] To the dismay of his father in around 29-25 BCE (*Tr.* 4.10.21-2), after completing his education, Ovid travelled for 18 months through Greece, Asia Minor and Sicily (*Tr.* 1.2.77-8; *Pont.* 2.10.21; Fast. 6.417-24).

[166] *OLD* 2, s.v. "*clavus*" 4a (Glare 2012).

[167] *OCD* 4, s.v. "*clavus*" (Hornblower et al.).

[168] Green (2005:271).

From 23/22 BCE, Ovid spent about a year studying law and administration as a part of the obligatory *tirocinium fori*.[169] During this time, he also held two minor positions. However, by 16 BCE, Ovid entirely abandoned the idea of a public senatorial career just as he became eligible for quaestorship, purposefully avoiding the obligatory *tirocinium militiae*.[170] While Ovid narrowly escaped his military obligations in Rome, he was forced to arm himself and defend Tomis while in exile (*Tr*. 4.1.71-6).

After avoiding military training in Rome, Ovid devoted himself entirely to literature as he could support himself with his equestrian status competence of 400,000 sesterces.[171] There is no evidence of how much Ovid was made to live on while in exile, so there can be no comparison between his pre- and post-exile financial status. But, even if he had money to spend, speculations on what he would buy look grim when considering Ovid's portrayal of Pontus as a perpetually raided (e.g. *Tr*. 4.1.75), barren wasteland (*Tr*. 3.10.68-71. *Pont*. 3.1.23, 8.15-6) with no wealth of reading material (*Tr*. 3.14.37). There would have been very little for Ovid to spend any possible wealth on.

As an adult, Ovid claimed to have had a house near the Capitol for his social life and a country villa on a hillside that overlooked the junction of the Via Clodia and Via Flaminia for vacations and concentrating on his work (*Tr*. 1.3.29-30; *Pont*. 1.8.41-4). Ovid states to have loved nature and enjoyed writing in his orchard and gardening (*Tr*. 1.11.37; *Pont*.1.8.45). Given his long-time enjoyment of gardening (*Pont*. 1.8.45-8), the lack of vegetation in Pontus and the surrounds (*Tr*. 3.10.75; *Pont*. 1.3.51-2; 3.1.19; 4.4.3), and the inability to safely cultivate any crops (*Tr*. 3.10.57; 4.1.81-3; 5.10.23; *Pont*. 1.8.61-2; 2.7.70) would have been a significant loss to Ovid. He states in *Epistulae* 1.8.49-50 that despite losing his own garden, he wishes he could have a plot of land to cultivate while exiled. The loss of such familiar activities and sights and his lack of access to lush environments[172] would have contributed to Ovid's feelings of isolation and loneliness, increasing the likelihood of him engaging in personification to assuage these negative feelings.

---

[169] The *tirocinium fori* was a kind of apprenticeship during which young men who had donned the *toga virilis* were entrusted to well-known individuals to learn of life in the forum (May 1995:436; Richlin 2011:95).

[170] The *tirocinium militae* was an obligatory period of military training (*Am*. 1.1.5.2.1-4; *Tr*. 4.1.71-2).

[171] Green (2005:xix-xx).

[172] Nature and natural elements have been shown to have benefits in cognition, mood, mental health and emotional well-being (Schertz, et al., Capaldi, et al., Lee, et al., Van Hedger et al., Bratman et al., etc.) Some sources, such as Taylor et al. (2017) have completed qualitative research on the links between decayed urban settings and negative emotional states and how the introduction of natural elements can help alleviate these negative impacts (Taylor et al., 2017).

Ovid went from his comfortable life in the shade to one filled with danger and fear; a life where he had minor status, was surrounded by what he viewed as uneducated people in a place that held no scholarly interest to him, where he had to perform military obligations and could not indulge in his pastimes or be surrounded by the nature he had become accustomed to. These changes would have increased Ovid's feeling of detachment from Rome and all things Roman, increasing his feelings of isolation and loneliness and increasing the chances of him turning to personification and depersonalisation as coping mechanisms to deal with these feelings.

2.2   Ovid's mental state in exile

It is typically assumed by scholars who explore Ovid's exilic psychology that Ovid was experiencing some depression while in exile,[173] which an understanding of Ovid's life before and after exile suggests was a likely outcome. Indeed, Fulkerson proposes that Ovid's alienating situation was likely to have led to depression[174] by pointing to his expressions of shipwrecks (e.g., *Pont.* 4.4.8), death (e.g., *Tr.* 3.11.25-32), and funerals (e.g., *Tr.* 1.1.117-8) which all pervade the exilic texts.[175] She argues that this depression could have led to or gone hand-in-hand with the actual physical illness that Ovid often describes.[176] This is very likely given Ovid's multiple complaints of symptoms the modern reader can attribute to depression. Ovid describes many of the symptoms of depression in his exilic texts. Nevertheless, such suppositions are based on conjecture. It is necessary to explore Ovid's expression of his psychology while in exile to stand by the argument that he was likely experiencing some form of mental distress similar to depression, if not depression itself.

---

[173] E.g., Claassen (2003:98) & Fulkerson (2023:114).

[174] In fact, she goes so far as to suggest that Ovid might have had bipolar disorder (Fulkerson (2023:113). She provides no references for this, but I suspect she found this idea in the work of Williams (1996:112-29), who argues that Ovid most likely wrote the *Ibis* during a period of mania. When paired with the commonly accepted belief that Ovid experienced some form of depression, this suggests that he could have had bipolar disorder. While it is possible that the change in his circumstances could have triggered the onset of bipolar if he were predisposed to it, I find it a dubious assumption to make that he had the potential for bipolar and it only manifested at age 50, when he was exiled, as there is little evidence from before his exile that points to him being mentally ill. Additionally, I do not think that he could have written the entire *Ibis* during a single manic episode. It is possible that he continued writing the *Ibis* whenever he experienced a manic episode. However, I do not think that the presence of a manic episode can be easily established through a literary work without a significant amount of guesswork, as the symptoms are typically ones that are not as easily written about as depressive symptoms. See the DSM-5 diagnostic criteria for mania (American Psychiatric Association, 2013:332) for a detailed list of the criteria needed to diagnose someone with mania, as well as the symptoms the individual must experience for this diagnosis to be valid. I do not think it is possible too posthumously diagnose Ovid with any mental disorder, which is why the focus of this section is on his expression of depression-like symptoms and not a posthumous diagnosis of depression or any disorder that entails it.

[175] See Evans (1983:54-5) for funerary imagery as the *topos* of an unhappy elegist, specifically Tibullus.

[176] Fulkerson (2023:114).

A situation such as being in exile should surely disrupt an individual's sense of self.[177] For example, Ovid was arguably no longer a Roman citizen or a Roman poet. He had retained his citizenship, being a *relegatus* and not *exul,* but he lost all the comfort and familiarity of being Roman and was instead thrust into the apparent chaos of Tomis where, supposedly, no one understood him, and he had to communicate through gestures (*Tr.* 5.10.35-6). These fundamental changes in Ovid's situation and identity should have triggered rather drastic changes in his mind.[178] Therefore, it is helpful to compare Ovid's self-reported mental state with the diagnostic criteria for Major Depressive Disorder as explained in the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (DSM-5), the current standard classification of mental disorders used by mental health professionals. This brief evaluation demonstrates that Ovid probably experienced some form of depression while in exile. The symptoms that will be analysed are a depressed mood, a markedly diminished interest or pleasure in activities, insomnia, significant weight loss without dieting and the associated decreased appetite, a diminished ability to think or concentrate, and recurrent thoughts of death.[179]

Concerning his depressed mood, Ovid writes about feeling a figurative numbness in his heart (*Tr.* 1.3.8), describing it as colder than snow and ice (*Pont.* 3.4.33). He often writes about crying (*Tr.* 1.3.4; 3.2.19), doing excessively so (*Pont.* 1.2.27), soaking pages in tears with them trickling down his chest (*Tr.* 4.1.95-8). This is noteworthy as the DSM-5 states that observations made by others may describe the individual as tearful.

In his literature from this period, Ovid displays a marked diminished interest or pleasure in activities that once brought him great joy. He also writes about a general apathy towards activities, writing that prolonged apathy has weakened his body (*Pont.* 1.10.3-4). Regarding an activity that previously brought him great joy, Ovid writes about a marked lack of interest in writing, stating that his fingers are rarely drawn to letters, and he has little to no pleasure in this task (*Pont.* 4.2.24). He states that he forces writing from an unwilling hand as there is no delight in setting his mind to the task (*Pont.* 1.5.10-11). He struggles to write, and when he does, he is ashamed of what he has written but does not correct it (*Pont.* 1.5.13-5). He claims not to have the energy to correct his work (*Pont.* 1.5.17, 3.9.18) as correcting it feels like hard labour to him (*Pont.* 3.9.20), and only a barely sane man would write and correct his writings among the

---

[177] Handel (1987:312). See Hilgard (1949), Jacobson (1959), Cattell (1966), Erikson (1968), and Reed (1972) for further reading on the disruption of an individual's sense of identity due to grave psychopathology.

[178] Handel (1987:312). For a discussion on radical transformations of the core of a person's identity due to extreme situations, see Tyrikian (1968).

[179] American Psychiatric Association (2013:160-1).

Getae (*Pont.* 3.9.31-2). He asks what the point of polishing his verses would be if the Getae were all who would read them (*Pont.* 1.5.61-2). Ovid explains that he continues to write because he does not like drinking or dice playing and cannot bend the Sarmatian bows (*Pont.* 1.5.45-7), seemingly the only things to do in Tomis.

Ovid does seem to understand that engaging in activities which previously brought him joy can still do so. In *Epistulae ex Ponto* 1.7, he writes that he would participate in farm work (51-3) so that his heart would not be fixed on its familiar sorrows, but he cannot because of the barbarian raids. He turns to poetry because of this and his life-long affinity for it. While he has lost some inclination towards it, when he does write, poetry acts as a kind of salve for his mind (*Tr.* 4.10.112). Ovid writes that it stops his mind from gazing at its woes and makes it forget his current situation. He writes that he feels no pain when his mind is inspired as it lifts his spirit above mortal suffering. Through poetry, he can escape exile (*Tr.* 4.1.39-46, *Pont.* 1.5.55), and he explains that he writes because it helps him feel as though he is not an exile anymore (*Pont.* 4.10.66-9).

In her 1990 article, Claassen identifies Ovid's tendency to travel to Rome through his mind's eye.[180] Claassen seems to believe this is a form of psychological escape from his current situation and argues this through his graphic representations of Tomis, as these sections show that Ovid can return to Rome if only in his mind's eye.[181] Following this train of logic, I propose that, as a way to comfort himself, Ovid takes part in escapism in his exilic literature. Escapism is "[a]n attempt to avoid awareness of aversive beliefs,"[182] and escapism in entertainment typically performs the function of whisking one away from everyday troubles to a place, either figuratively physical or literally mental, where one can fantasize about being in a better situation than the current situation one finds oneself in.[183] While this is certainly true for the consumer of escapist entertainment, an argument can be made that the creation of such entertainment would be equally cathartic to the artist.

In his exilic texts, Ovid often travels to Rome in his mind's eye to gaze upon festivities and familiar places and spend time with loved ones to escape from his situation in Tomis. According to Ovid, it is a kindness that the mind can go where it wishes and that he can enter

---

[180] She notes that this ability grows in importance throughout the *Epistulae ex Ponto* as it offers Ovid the ability to live vicariously in Rome and extend his reach towards the familiar (Claassen 1990:109).
[181] Claassen (1990:110).
[182] Longeway (1990:1).
[183] Longeway (1990:1).

Rome, unseen by all (*Pont.* 3.5.48-50). He does this a handful of times (*Tr.* 3.4.56-62; 4.2.57-64. *Pont.* 1.8.35-8; 4.9.41-50) but states that it is detrimental to him as each "journey" renews the bitterness of exile and makes it feel more recent to him (*Pont.* 3.7.33-4). Ovid's "journeys" to Rome are often quite detailed, and while there are portions of the text where Ovid describes Rome, such as in the first poem of the *Tristia* where he sends the little book to Rome in his stead and the third one where he describes his last night in Rome, there are other times where the descriptions of Rome are, on the surface, purely for ornamental reasons with little narrative value. In *Tristia* 3.12.1-13, Ovid vividly describes springtime in the Roman countryside or more rural areas as a picturesque setting involving a lot of unplanned greenery, whimsical animals and laughing children. He goes on to describe the time of ease in the city with its string of festive days and the activities that would be common during the springtime (17-24). In *Tristia* 4.2, Ovid vividly describes Germany's submission to Rome and the ensuing ceremonies and joyous celebration. In *Epistulae ex Ponto* 1.8.35-8, Ovid mentally revisits the familiar sites of Rome, namely the *fora*, temples, theatres, porticoes, Campus, ponds and canals and the Aqua Virgo. In *Epistulae ex Ponto* 4.9.41-50, Ovid visits Rome in his mind to witness Graecinus's consulship and watch him carry out acts as a consul, such as dispensing justice (43) and speaking to the Senate (47).

In these scenes, Ovid is clearly painting a picture of his outsider's view of a utopian Rome with its vivid and defined seasons, triumphs and ceremonies, and development. This seems to have been consciously meant to starkly contrast Ovid's depictions of Tomis as a small town in perpetual winter, barely able to protect itself from the raiding horse riders. However, the amount of effort Ovid puts into these descriptions signifies that they perform personal functions for him, such as a way to escape from his currently grim situation and enjoy the familiarities of Rome, even if only for a short time. Ovid claims that although he cannot be with his loved ones in person, he can see them in his mind (*Tr.* 3.4.56-62, *Pont.* 1.8.31-4). He sees his wife's form before his eyes as if she were there (*Tr.* 3.4.59). His "visits" with living friends can be seen when he writes about Atticus, whose image is always in front of Ovid's eyes and whose features he sees in his mind (*Pont.* 2.4.7-8) and when he speaks to Cotta Maximus in his mind (*Pont.* 3.5.48-50). Ovid also "visits" departed friends. This is seen when Ovid is grieving at Celsus's death. He writes that his image comes to his mind as if he were there (*Pont.* 1.97-9). Ovid takes time to engage in activities that make him feel closer to Rome, and while he does complain that he has no energy to write and edit, the nine polished books examined in this

dissertation are proof otherwise. Ovid likely felt he was not doing his best work because he was not feeling his best and no longer enjoyed the activity to the degree he used to.

Similarly to the creative drain Ovid experiences, his sleep also suffers while in exile. Insomnia and fatigue are well-known symptoms of depression.[184] In *Tristia* 3.8.24-30, Ovid describes a perpetual weakness of the body and writes that he is not sure whether a mental illness or the location drains his limbs. He also writes that he has been experiencing insomnia since he reached Pontus (*Tr.* 3.8.27). He writes that sleep fails him and that he lies awake thinking about his situation (*Pont.* 1.10.21-3). He explains that he has no strength and that his limbs are more pallid than fresh wax (*Pont.* 1.10.27-8). When he does sleep, he has terrible nightmares that imitate the very real dangers he faces while awake, compounding his suffering (*Pont.* 1.2.43-4). These instances show that Ovid was experiencing marked changes in his energy levels and sleep quality, congruent with depression.

In line with expectations in the DSM-5, Ovid claims to have experienced significant weight loss and a decrease in appetite since being exiled. Ovid writes in *Tristia* 4.6.42 that he barely had enough skin to cover his bones, indicating that he had lost weight. This weight loss is attributed to an inability to eat (*Tr.* 3.8.28). He writes that his appetite is gone, and nothing makes him hungry (*Pont.* 1.10.7-8). Although it is not sure if the weight loss is entirely attributed to Ovid being incapable of eating or if there was no food to eat as in *Epistulae ex Ponto* 1.10.31-2, Ovid writes that his weakened state was not caused by overeating as there is no opportunity to do so. Logically, one might assume that there would be food in a settlement the size of Tomis, so this could be an attempt on Ovid's part to garner sympathy.

While challenging to separate from his lack of pleasure in writing due to how closely linked the two are to Ovid, he does seem to express a diminished ability to think or concentrate as he writes about a lethargy-like death gripping his thoughts (*Pont.* 1.2.27), confessing that his mind is weakened by misery (*Pont.* 1.3.32). He complains that his skill does not respond as before (*Pont.* 4.2.15) and has become weakened by exile and neglect (*Tr.* 3.14.31-6; 5.12.22). He writes that his imagination is dulled (*Tr.* 5.12.21), and his poetry flows from an impoverished vein (*Pont.* 4.2.19-20). Only Ovid could know and write about these symptoms as they occur in the mind. There were no diagnostic criteria or elaborate psychiatric structure in ancient Rome, so it is possible that he did experience these "symptoms" as a part of his possible acute depression. However, it is also possible that he played these symptoms up for sympathy in

---

[184] Fava (2004:27).

Rome, as while no one would have known exactly what to look for, the symptoms are dreadful, and anyone who cared about Ovid would not want him to experience these feelings.[185]

Throughout the exilic texts, Ovid seems to have death and dying on his mind, with him regularly referring to himself as already being dead in many ways, such as referring to the night of his exile as his funeral rites (*Tr.* 1.1.117-8, 7.38; 3.14.20-22. *Ep.* 1.9.17), referring to exile itself as his funeral rites, writing that his *Metamorphoses* was saved from them (*Tr.* 1.1.117-8, 7.38; 3.14.20-22), or that his exilic works are befitting of them (*Tr.* 5.1.47).[186] Additionally, he refers to his works as being orphaned in *Tristia* 3.7. He also often wishes to be already dead but is vehemently opposed to the concept of dying in Pontus or away from Rome (e.g., *Tr.* 1.2.51-6) as he fears that his soul will forever wander around the Pontic lands with no hope of rest (*Tr.* 3.3.59-64).

Regarding Ovid's thoughts on his mental decline during exile, it should be noted that he seems to remain optimistic, writing that he is not so wholly crushed that his mind is disturbed by his troubles (*Tr.* 5.6.23-4). Ovid later writes that his situation has not changed his temperament and that he still possesses his calm reason (*Pont.* 4.9.90-2). This shows that Ovid was not completely overwhelmed by his mental state and had periods where he felt somewhat mentally normal. However, he often claims that there is something wrong with his mind. In the same poem, *Tristia* 5.6, he goes on to suppose that his mind is disturbed (*Tr.* 5.6.25). He also writes that it is "troubled" (*confusae Pont.* 1.3.3)[187] and compares it to his body, which is also "ill" (*aegra Tr.* 3.8.33-4). He further describes his mind as being worse than his body as it is endlessly absorbed in contemplating its ills (*Tr.* 4.6.41-4). Even when his body becomes accustomed to exile, his mind does not improve (*Tr.* 5.2.3-8). This suggests that even he knew something was awry.

Part of the symptoms above, which Ovid describes, have been noted by Nagle as written in typical elegiac language. She suggests that this was both thorough and intentional,[188] as in amatory elegy, love is often described metaphorically as either being a physical illness or

---

[185] It must be added here that Ovid's single goal throughout his exilic literature, possibly even the reason for its existence, is recall to Rome or relocation to another, milder place of exile (Wheeler [1924] 1988:xviii). Ovid begs multiple friends throughout the *Epistulae ex Ponto* for help with this goal (e.g. *Pont.* 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.6, 1.7, 1.8, 1.10), even realising in a letter that he might be boring the reader with his constant begging but refusing to stop (*Pont.* 4.15.29, 33).

[186] Ovid's thoughts of death are covered in detail in Chapter 4 as they relate to his complex intrapersonal depersonalisation.

[187] *OLD*, s.v. "*confusus*" 4a & b.

[188] Nagle (1980:63).

causing physical illness.[189] The symptoms found commonly in both amatory elegy and Ovidian exilic depictions of illness, as identified by Fulkerson, are weariness, sleeplessness, loss of appetite and weight, and pallor.[190] Both Fulkerson and Nagle suggest that Ovid used elegiac terms and concepts to express the illness brought about by exile because the only way he knew how to express illness was poetically. I agree with both Nagle and Fulkerson that Ovid was probably using this poetic language as an expression of the symptoms he was experiencing. However, this does not detract from the fact that these are also some of the symptoms of psychological decline, and it is apparent that Ovid suffered more symptoms than he expressed in his amatory works.[191]

2.3   Conclusion

Ovid was in an entirely new situation when he was exiled; his status as an equestrian was essentially stripped from him, and he was surrounded by people whom he considered to be barbarians, who had no wealth of books for him to read instead of his usual milieu, meaning that he lacked the luxury of counsel who could support him and help him by providing critiques to his works. Additionally, after avoiding his military duty in his youth, he was forced to take up arms against the barbarian raiders in Tomis as an older man. Due to the constant barbarian raids in Tomis, Ovid's wealth would have meant next to nothing as he would have had nothing to spend it on. These raids also meant that cultivation of flora and agriculture was virtually impossible, removing Ovid's ability to engage in one of his favourite pastimes. All of these circumstances combined would have created a severe level of isolation and loneliness for Ovid.

The drastic changes in Ovid's life led to drastic changes in his identity and mind. His decline in mental health can be seen partly through his identification with shipwrecks, his seeming preoccupation with death and funerals, and a series of self-reported, well-known symptoms of depression. Aware of his unfit state of mind and body, he may have expressed his symptoms in elegiac terms. However, he nevertheless writes of all of the typical symptoms of depression, such as depressed mood, diminished interest in pleasure or activities which once brought him joy, insomnia and fatigue, weight loss and a decrease in appetite, diminished ability to think or concentrate, and recurrent thoughts of death. Notably, some part of the witty and playful poet

---

[189] Fulkerson (2023:108), Nagle (1980:24-70). See Caston (2006) for an exploration of the notion of love as illness in the writings of individuals such as Cicero and Lucretius.

[190] Fulkerson (2023:113).

[191] In fact, Ovid himself makes a point of saying that he was not ailed by love, in the *Epistulae ex Ponto* 1.10, seemingly resigned to the fact that he is experiencing a mental decline.

did remain in the face of all his woes. This suggests that while he may have had depressive symptoms, he may not have been outright depressed, or he may not have been experiencing one continuous stretch of depression. Nevertheless, regardless of whether or not Ovid was actually depressed or only experienced depression-like symptoms, from this discussion, it can be surmised that he was in genuine mental distress, experiencing true isolation and loneliness, and not simply using exile as a metaphor for his poetic decline.

Chapter 3: Personification: Creation of characters

3.1   Introduction

When faced with extreme isolation and loneliness, people are known to anthropomorphise the objects around them as a coping mechanism, thereby providing them with the company and comfort they are unwilling or unable to receive from others.[192] Claassen acknowledges in her 1990 article that Ovid uses personification on inanimate objects for lack of human contact.[193] When he was exiled to Tomis, Ovid faced extreme isolation as he lost direct physical contact with everyone dear to him and the poetry circles and audience to which he was accustomed. Soon after being exiled, he began to anthropomorphise objects and concepts from his surroundings in his exilic texts to fulfil the human roles he consciously and subconsciously needed to be filled. These characters he created are typically comforting characters. The most important characters he created to fulfil his need for comfort and companionship were the Comforting Muses and his books as children. These characters provided some level of comfort for Ovid during his exile and filled close human roles for him, such as dear friends.

3.2   Comforting Muse

The Comforting Muses are the first of the characters who comfort Ovid while in exile. In the exilic texts, Claassen identifies many ways in which Ovid identifies with non-humans as a form of depersonalisation of himself. One of these non-humans he identifies with is his "Comforting Muse", a term seemingly coined by her.[194] The Comforting Muse is not only an externalised deity of inspiration but also the personified creator of his works, Ovid's intellect, and poetry itself.[195] According to Claassen, this character is first seen in its complete form in *Tristia* 4.10.117-24 in Ovid's invocation of his Muse.[196] Claassen has explored the Comforting Muse as a consolation character who acts as an extension of his personality, to a degree. She describes Ovid's "Muse" as having four aspects: firstly, that song (poetry) soothes or relieves suffering; secondly, the composition of poetry takes the form of a kind of occupational therapy for Ovid; thirdly, it provides Ovid with a way to reach out to those in Rome while also granting Ovid immortality; and fourthly, his Muse acts as a "consolatory goddess" who offers Ovid a way to

---

[192] Epley, et al. (2007:864).
[193] Claassen (1990:103).
[194] Claassen (1990:114).
[195] Claassen (1990:114).
[196] Claassen (1990:114).

alleviate the anger of Augustus.[197] According to Claassen, Ovid's "Muse" often stands for his skill or talent as a poet, his works themselves, the recipient of inspiration, and is sometimes the creator of his works instead of her typical role as an externalised deity of inspiration.

As I understand them, the Comforting Muses are not wholly a depersonalisation of Ovid. They are separate entities who act as his close, supportive friends and are inspired by the goddesses Ovid's readers would likely have been acquainted with. However, the Comforting Muses are quite far removed in personality and attributes from the Muses of old, as they are a personification of several aspects of Ovid's poetry. When examining the Comforting Muses, from my perspective, Ovid seems to ascribe far more human agency and motives to them by attributing human characteristics than to those who inspired them, signifying an underlying motivation to make them "more human" than they would initially have been. However, I do agree with Claassen that there is an aspect of depersonalisation because, as he is personifying the Muses, Ovid also simultaneously depersonalises himself as the author of his works by ascribing the agency of writing his poetry and thus attributing the *carmen* part of Ovid's charge (the poem that got him exiled) to something other than himself.

In Roman mythology, as in original Greek mythology, the Muses were the personified deities of literary inspiration and intellectual undertakings,[198] often used as metonymies of literary discourse.[199] There were nine canonical Muses during Ovid's time with each presiding over a specific art: Calliope presided over epic poetry, Clio over history, Euterpe over flute-playing and flute music, Melpomene over tragedy, Terpsichore over dancing and the accompanying music, usually lyre music, Erato over lyric and love poetry, Polyhymnia over hymns to the gods, Urania over astronomy and the heavens; and Thalia over comedy and bucolic poetry (Hes. *Theog.* 76).[200] Some traditions held that there were only three (Paus. 9.29.2 cf. 9.29.3; Plut. *Quaes. Conv.* 9.14.3) or four (Cic. *Nat. D.* 3.54) Muses. However, both Pausanias and Cicero mention the existence or creation of the nine Muses shortly after mentioning the lower number. Plutarch also speaks of the number nine, which can be divided into three, a possible allusion to the nine Muses.[201] Regardless of their number, the Muses' attitude towards humanity shown in writers other than Ovid is the same as the Olympian gods, as they do not hesitate to destroy a mortal who dares commit a perceived slight against them. One such

---

[197] Claassen (2008:78-9).
[198] Taback (2002:1).
[199] Rosati (2002:231).
[200] Taback (2002:3).
[201] Taback (2002:3).

individual is Thamyris, whom they maimed and whose skill they removed for boasting that he could best them in song (Hom. *Il.* 2.594-600). They are also known to be divinely contemptuous towards humankind as they do not care if the art they inspire is true or false (Hes. *Theog.* 26-8).

Muses are often invoked in classical literature. Quintus Ennius was the first to invoke the Muses who, with their feet, beat mighty Olympus (Enn. *Ann.* 1.1). The Muses were typically invoked for inspiration.[202] The ancient Greek and Roman poets often depict themselves in submissive, receiving roles such as servants, priests or prophets but never as simply receiving inspiration from them.[203] Ovid's early use of the Muses is almost the inverse of this. He claims in the *Ars* that he was not given inspiration by the Muses at all (Ov. *Ars am.* 1.27-8), and in the *Metamorphoses*, Ovid invokes all the gods to inspire his work instead of invoking only the Muses as was tradition (Ov. *Met.* 1.2-3).[204] Then, in the exilic texts, his first reference to the Muses is unusual as he says he burned the *Metamorphoses* because he detested the Muses (*Tr.* 1.7.21), and his following invocation has him claiming that they, as well as Apollo, had not brought him any aid (*Tr.* 3.2.3-4). But he eventually changes his opinion and invokes them favourably in *Tristia* 4.10.117-24 as friends and comforting figures. He creates a more personal tone when referring to them, which is far more playful and intimate than their depictions in Homer's *Iliad* and Hesiod's *Theogony*.

Ovid's exilic Comforting Muses are inspired by the typical goddesses depicted in literature. However, unlike the other gods depicted in Ovidian literature, the exilic Comforting Muses are personified and given far more human attributes than the exilic Olympians and do not always fulfil their original deities' functions of simple inspiration. The Comforting Muses generally do not exact unjust punishment on mortals or have exaggerated powers, and they do not have exaggerated faults or flaws, as their faults and flaws are the same as Ovid's, and they are often shown to be soft and caring. Thus, Ovid's Comforting Muses are seen as openly benevolent and kind towards him, the poet whom they wounded. This also shows Ovid's ambivalence towards poetry as a concept, as it has in the past harmed him but now brings him the only solace he finds. He is fearful of what it can and has done to him (*Tr.* 2.3) but turns to it nevertheless because it provides him with an escape from his situation (*Tr.* 4.10.117; *Pont.* 4.2.45).

---

[202] Taback (2002:16).
[203] Murray & Fantham (2010).
[204] Murray & Fantham (2010).

Ovid sometimes refers to one or more of the Comforting Muses by using their traditional roles as inspiring deities. This trope is usually seen towards the end of his *Tristia* as he loses hope (*Tr.* 2.313-4; 4.1.87-8, 9.15-6, 10.20, 39-40). In general, Ovid refers to both the "Muses" and a single "Muse", but he rarely names the Muse he is referring to, implying a reference to a Comforting Muse. He once gives the name Calliope (*Tr.* 2.568) and twice gives the name Thalia as the name of his Muse in his *Tristia* (*Tr.* 4.10.56; 5.9.31). Interestingly, Calliope was the Muse of epic,[205] while Thalia was the Muse of comedy, not the Muse of lyric or love poetry, as Erato was the Muse of lyric poetry.[206] According to Plato, Erato would be the Muse for a love poet to gain the favour of (Pl. *Phdr.* 259 C-D). She is also the one Ovid invokes three times, twice in his *Ars Amatoria* (Ov. *Ars am.* 2.16, 425) and once in the *Fasti* (Ov. *Fast.* 195, 349). It could be that in the abovementioned three instances seen in the *Tristia*, Ovid's Muse at the moment he is writing is a Muse of epic or comedy. In contrast, the other numerous references to an unnamed "Muse" could have been references to a uniquely Ovidian muse he created specifically for his exilic literature, the Comforting Muse. This is not a Muse of any specific genre as Ovid switches between different styles of content while continuing to use the elegiac metre, ranging from comedic moments such as when, in a lengthy passage, he admonishes Augustus for not banning almost anything ever written to stop anyone from being inspired to commit crimes (*Tr.* 2.359-492) to far more melancholic moments such as when he writes his own epitaph (*Tr.* 3.3.73-6). However, instead, she is a Muse of familiarity, comfort and solace. She, along with her sisters, are the only friends of Ovid's who travel with him to Pontus (*Tr.* 4.1.50) and provide him with comfort when he experiences his hardships through their continued presence (*Tr.* 4.1.49) and by allowing him to be spirited away from Pontus to a place where his exile cannot hurt him (*Tr.* 4.10.119-20), as well as providing him an outlet for his emotions and ideas while he is exiled. This Comforting Muse is less of a simple deity of inspiration and more of a personification of writing who is also one of Ovid's oldest and closest friends. The Comforting Muse can be her own entity, which is seen most commonly when Ovid very rarely names individual Muses but also sometimes refers to her as a pre-existing deity (*Tr.* 5.9.31) or sometimes as a whole group (*Tr.* 4.1.50).

Ovid uses the Muses in his exilic texts in several ways. He most commonly uses the Muse or Muses to refer to his talent (*Tr.* 2.495-6, 568; 4.9.31-2 *Pont*. 1.1.20; 3.5.21), his poetry or possibly the concept of poetry in general (*Tr.* 2.3, 495-6, 568; 3.2.6, 7.9; 4.10.56; 5.1.19, 7.28.

---

[205] Taback (2002:5); Evelyn-White H. G. (trans) (1921) *Ausonius.* Vol 2. Appendix 3, line 8, pp 280.
[206] Taback (2002:5).

Pont. 1.5.40; 2.4.14; 3.5.21, 9.3-6; 4.15.40, 16.45-6) and as the creator of his works (*Tr.* 4.9.31-2. *Pont.* 1.1.20; 4.2.27-8, 13.31).[207] However, Ovid most extensively refers to the Muses as his poetry or poetry in general. This could be a personifying aspect whereby Ovid creates entities out of his poetry with which he can surround himself. Additionally, the references to the Muses are often ambiguous, with one reference to them referring to them as externalised deities of inspiration as well as his poetry, for example (e.g., *Tr.* 2.3). These ambiguous references make up the bulk of Ovid's references to the Muses. For example, in *Tristia* 4.9.31-2, Ovid tells his Muse, his talent, to "sound the retreat" while the recipient of the venomous poem is still able to hide their name. In these lines, Ovid is telling his talent to end the poem before the recipient's name is revealed. This could also be an instance of Ovid referring to the Muse as the creator of his works. This, in turn, allows Ovid to shift the blame for his poetry onto the Muse character.

Ovid refers to the Muses as personifications of his poetry roughly fourteen times throughout the exilic texts. As is typical for this topic, many of these references are ambiguous, such as when he says that his Muse is not eager for applause (*Tr.* 5.7.28) or when he tells his Muse to be silent about the name of the recipient of a poem (*Tr.* 5.9.25-32). These are ambiguous because they could also be read to refer to the Muses as externalised deities of inspiration and the creators of his works, respectively. However, some very clear examples of this trope are seen in the *Epistulae ex Ponto,* such as when Ovid says that often a new Muse was submitted to Atticus's criticism (*Pont.* 2.4.14). Ovid also says that if asking for a different location to be exiled in is the only crime his Muse commits, he is fine with it (*Pont.* 3.9.3-6), and he says that if his Muse travels beyond the Getae, everyone will know that Sextus is the reason for Ovid's wellbeing (*Pont.* 4.15.39-40). Ovid also later says that his Muse's bright name will be read among others in Rome (*Pont.* 4.16.45-6). In these cases, Ovid is very clearly referring to the Muses as his poetry, which is submitted for Atticus's criticism, asks for a change of exile, travels to Rome and is read by others.

Lastly, when referring to his Muse as the creator of his works, Ovid shows his Muse, "native" or otherwise, as directly being the one to pen his works (*Pont.* 4.13.31). This is the only direct reference to the Muses as his works' creators. All other references are ambiguous.

There are other instances of Ovid using the Muses as externalised deities of inspiration, but these references are often ambiguous. Within *Tristia* 4, Ovid says that his Muse suffers him to return to poetry and the ancient rites (*Tr.* 4.1.87-8) and drew him subtly to her work as a youth

---

[207] Claassen (1990:114).

(*Tr.* 4.10.20) while later urging him on to seek the safe seclusion that his tastes had always loved (39-40). He also says that the Muses as a group will grant him strength and their weapons in revenge against the recipient of a poem (*Tr.* 4.9.15-6). In these cases, while relatively obscure, the Muses can be seen in their traditional forms as externalising deities who influence Ovid's life from the outside as separate and defined entities.

By referring to his Muse as both the creator of his works and as a personification of aspects of poetry, Ovid is adding a layer of humanity through his highly anthropomorphised Comforting Muse character, breathing a kind of life into inanimate concepts such as poetry and his talent as a poet, and depersonalising himself by removing his agency from writing poetry and placing that agency onto something else. This is how his Muse comforts him. She is the personified poetry that provides him with entities to interact with and an escape from the horrors of exile. She is also an entity onto which he can shift the blame for his exile, thus providing a means to remove the guilt he probably felt as the one who caused his exile while also providing Ovid some much-needed comfort from these negative emotions.

However, it must be noted that each of these different depictions is usually not clearly defined, and one instance containing reference to a Muse could refer to her as Ovid's skill, his work, as well as the creator of his works as seen in *Tristia* 2.21, where Ovid says that the Muse who stirred Augustus's anger can also calm it. This is seen again when Ovid says that he was ruined or wounded by his Muse (*Tr.* 2.495, 568; 3.7.9), as Ovid could be referring to either his talent, his poetry or poetry in general, the Muses as the creators of his works, or even the Muses as externalised deities of inspiration onto which he shifts the blame for his exile. There is an instance where Ovid could be referring to the Muses as poetry and his poetry's writers. This is seen when Ovid rhetorically asks why he returns to the newly condemned Muses (*Tr.* 2.3). He could also be referring to them as being condemned by him for being the ones to have caused his exile by either being his poetry, his talent, or the ones who wrote his poetry, and not literally condemned to exile by Augustus, in which case they could also be seen as externalised deities of inspiration whom the emperor has condemned. There are also times where references to the Muses could be seen as references to them both as externalised deities of inspiration as well as his poetry (*Tr.* 2.12-4, 354. *Pont.* 1.5.41-2) or poetry in general (*Tr.* 2.3). Other times where the Muses can be seen as linked to the poet as well as externalised deities are seen in instances such as when Ovid says his Muse is more wanton than his life (*Tr.* 3.2.6) or when he asks why his Muse was ever playful (*Tr.* 5.1.19). In both cases, the Muse who Ovid speaks of can be read to be his poetry, the creator of his works, and an externalised deity. Given that they can

so often be read to be the creators of his works, Ovid seems to be depicting them as directly influencing his life, providing entities for himself to interact with and which fulfils his psychological need for human-like interaction while simultaneously creating entities onto which he can shift the blame for the writing of his works.

In his exilic works, Ovid often depicts the Muses as directly influencing his life and situation. They are the ones who ruined and harmed him (*Tr.* 2.13-4, 495-6, 568; 3.8.9; 4.1.25-6), but his Muse also helped him and was a friend on his flight from Rome, easing his ills (*Tr.* 4.1.19-26, 49-50). Ovid has two distinct views of his Muse that he holds simultaneously. These views show the role this character plays for him and the psychological needs it fulfils. On the one hand, Ovid, to a degree, blames his Muse for his exile, and on the other, his Muse is seemingly the only thing that provides him solace.

In his exilic works, Ovid usually depicts the personified Muses as having more of a direct influence on his life and situation than the Olympians about whom he often speaks. Even the Augustus-Jupiter character is not shown to be interacting with Ovid in the way the Muses do, as his single interaction with Ovid takes place in the distant past, both temporally and spatially, while the Muses continuously interact with Ovid in the present or at the very least the recent past. Sometimes, Ovid's interactions with the Muses are shown in a positive light in the "comforting Muse" trope described by Claassen. While only fully defined in *Tr*istia 4.10, where Ovid speaks to his Muse directly, his Muse is described as the medicine to his cares and the reason he is still alive and urging him to strive for the life he had always dreamed of. The Muses are seen as willing to help him and lend him their strength and weapons (*Tr.* 4.9.15-6) and being physically with him (*Tr.* 4.1.20, 49-50). I believe the Comforting Muse as a trope is seen far earlier in the exilic texts at *Tristia* 4.1.19-22, 49-50 where, although she does not directly comfort him as she does in *Tristia* 4.10 and he does not directly address her, she is described as helping him when he left Rome and remaining his only friend in his flight as she alone was unafraid of the dangers he would face. In this way, Ovid's Muse provides him comfort and support (*Tr.* 4.1.19-22). Ovid says it is right to revere the goddesses who ease his ills (*Tr.* 4.1.49), showing that he draws some form of comfort from them. In *Tristia* 4.10, Ovid speaks directly to his Muse, thanking her for granting him solace (*Tr.* 4.10.117), saying that she comes as a rest from and cure for care (*Tr.* 4.10.118). He says that she is both his friend and his guide who spirits him from the Danube to a place in the midst of Helicon (*Tr.* 4.10.119-20), providing him a way to escape from his troubles in exile. While the abovementioned instances are the most extensive, passing references to the Comforting Muse are sprinkled

throughout the exilic texts. One of those is when Ovid says that the only cure and rest he gets is in the practice and study of the Muses (*Tr.* 5.1.31-3).

Other times, the Muse or Muses are shown to be the reason for his downfall. Ovid says that if he were wise, he would rightly hate the Muses who ruined their devotee (*Tr.* 2.13-4). Unlike others who were not ruined by their Muses (*Tr.* 2.495-6),[208] out of all the others, Ovid is the one his Muse wounds (*Tr.* 2.568), and he says in both the *Tristia* and the *Epistulae* that the Muses are the cause of his downfall (*Tr.* 1.7.21; 2.3, 21, 496, 568; 4.1.19; 5.12.45. *Pont.* 3.5.21). However, there are far more references to them in this context in the *Tristia,* especially in Book 2, where it seems Ovid is trying to deflect blame from the *carmen* of his charge.

The complex duality shown by the comforting Muse and the seemingly guilty Muse is deepened by the fact that although he links the Muses to the cause of his exile, he does not seem to hold a grudge against them,[209] calling his Muse a "guest despite misfortune" (*Tr.* 4.1.87) and offering respect to them while going on to say that they are the reason he was exiled (*Tr.* 5.12.45). While deflecting blame onto them (*Tr.* 2.9-10), he does not seem to consider them at fault for their actions, calling them dutiful (*Pont.* 1.1.20) and never once implying that they had malicious intent. One possible reason for this "seemingly guilty Muse", which Ovid never truly views as guilty or malicious, is that Ovid does not view his poetry as guilty of committing a crime or inciting any indecency, a concept that he tries to push forward in the second book of the *Tristia* (*Tr.* 2.263-312). Another possible reason for Ovid not holding any grudge against the Muses who led to his downfall is because he cannot be done with the Muses as currently writing poetry and being inspired, even if minimally, are serving a crucial function for Ovid: a means to escape from exile, both literally and figuratively. Literally, Ovid needs to correspond with Rome to secure either a recall or a change of location, and figuratively, Ovid needs to write to escape his situation in Tomis to a place where his struggles do not exist, usually Rome. Ovid himself says that while he sometimes curses the poetry and his Muses that have harmed him at length, he still cannot be without them (*Tr.* 5.7.31-3).

---

[208] Namely Ennius (259-60, 423-4), Lucretius (261-2, 425-6), Catullus (427-30), Calvus (431-2), Ticidas (433-4), Memmius (433-4), Cinna (435), Anser (435), Cornifcius (436), Cato (436), Varro (439-40), Hortensius (441), Servius (441), Sisenna (443), Aristides (413-414), Gallus (445-6), Tibullus (447-63), Propertius (465-6), those who write about the art of playing dice (471), sports (485-6), cosmetics (487), dinner-party etiquette (488), pottery (489), and brewing alcohol (490).

[209] Williams points out that the Muse can fulfil the role of the elegiac mistress with whom Ovid fell in love at a very early age (*Tr.* 4.10.19-20). Their love affair goes on to survive the terrible consequences of the *Ars* and continues to sustain him during his wretched exile. The reason Williams gives for this theory is that elegy thrives on the tension that a love-hate relationship provides (Williams 1994:152-3).

Another trend which must be outlined is who the Muses are shown to be influencing and how this changes over time. Knowing that the Muses are intrinsically linked to inspiration and artistic talent, Ovid's depiction of their influence can relate to his passion for his craft and his mental state as he expresses his psychological state through his poetry. Ovid only ever depicts the Muses as influencing him in the *Tristia* but uses them more and more to refer to other poets' talent and poetry in the *Epistulae*. This happens either when he gives advice, such as when he tells his friend Maximus to play court to them if he wants his recitations approved and to study the Muses (*Pont*. 1.5.56, 64), or in the description of other poets' talent, such as when he refers to his friend Cotys as following the Muses' path to the bright stars rather than frittering his leisure away sleeping (*Pont*. 2.9.62). Furthermore, later in the *Epistulae,* he refers to his friend Suillius as having become the rarest jewel in the Muses' crown, saying in line 78 that the Muse and Jupiter both cohabit in his heart, giving him the arts of both prince and scholar (*Pont*. 4.8.70). He then speaks of Tuticanus as having advised him on his writings while turning out a Phaeácid worthy of Homer under the Muses' own tutelage (*Pont*. 4.12.28). He again refers to a friend, Cotta Maximus, as the Muses' jewel (*Pont*. 4.16.42).[210] In both of these types of advice and references to others, Ovid is passing on the torch in a way. As his own creative spirit diminishes, so does the creative spirit of others in Rome grow. It is interesting since he is not referring to a "new generation" of poets but speaking to his peers, yet he is declining faster than them due to his exile, feeling like an aged man passing on his mantle while actually referring to his equals in age who are simply mentally able to produce the kind of work that Ovid was once capable of producing.

When we reach the *Epistulae*, the Muses' influence on Ovid as external inspiring deities seems to have diminished drastically as they do not come to Tomis when called, and Ovid writes with an unwilling hand (*Pont*. 1.5.10-12). This trope continues throughout the *Epistulae,* where, by the fourth book, he speaks about his reluctant Muse working only under compulsion, laying a bored hand on the tablets he takes up (*Pont*. 4.2.27-8). Ovid's depiction of the Muse being reluctant and working under compulsion shows his apathy towards a craft that was once his reason for being. Apathy towards once-loved activities is a common and well-known sign of deep depression.[211] When telling Maximus about the poor quality of his exilic work, physically being shabby due to the poor quality of the instruments he possesses, he says that this is the

---

[210] In the *Epistulae*, the number of times the Muses are linked to exerting influence over or interacting with Ovid versus others are 3:1 in book one; 0:2 in book 2; 4:0 in book 3 (although he is mainly deflecting blame to them in these references) and 5:7 in book 4.

[211] American Psychiatric Association (2013:160-1).

kind of Muse that flourishes here in Tomis (*Pont.* 3.8.22). Later in *Epistulae ex Ponto* 4.2.41-6, he says that since the local activities such as wine, dice and farming do not appeal to him, he can only write poetry but calls his Muse a frigid consolation. This could show his belief that his talent has left him mentally and physically. Mentally, here refers to the quality of his work, which has declined, showing a decrease in their influence on and favour of him. Physically, it refers to his pleas for clemency having been ignored, meaning that his Muse (his poetry) had failed to save him from his fate or provide him with genuine consolation.

The Comforting Muses are characters created by Ovid through personification. They serve to comfort him, both physically, by providing him with an outlet for his negative emotions and psychologically, by providing him with a chance of reprieve from his negative emotions linked to the guilt of causing his exile. However, above this is the ever-present notion of personification being used to assuage loneliness during extreme isolation, as laid out in the SEEK model. Arguably, the Comforting Muses do more for Ovid than any of the other characters he creates as he depicts them as directly comforting him while he is in exile, whereas characters such as his books, which he personifies into his children, can only provide Ovid with the hope of recall or relocation. They do not comfort him emotionally with their mere presence.

3.3   Books as children

Similarly to the Comforting Muse, Claassen has examined a well-known comforting personification of Ovid: that of his books as his children (*Tr.* 1.1; 3.1; 5.4), which she believes he once again accomplishes through the depersonalisation of his own sense of self into his cause or work.[212] It is a motif that, as the convention it would have become by the *Epistulae ex Ponto*, is established progressively, beginning in the monologue that is *Tristia* 1.1. This motif is further explored through passing references to the works as either family of each other or of Ovid, along with larger portions of text such as *Tristia* 3.1 and 5.4. An example she gives is when the personified poem speaks in *Tristia* 5.4, telling the reader that Ovid weeps while he writes and asking what Ovid does not, namely for a friend to look after his interests (*Tr.* 5.4.49-50). Claassen says that here the reader of the works knows what Ovid is asking through the poem and states that Ovid, as the actual speaker, and his poetry have fully merged into one.[213]

---

[212] She notes that this was not an entirely new concept for Ovid as the *Amores* contains many instances of personification of individual poems or books, just not as his children. She also states that these personifications can sometimes be casual in nature, involving the employment of human speech and anatomy as an ornamental flourish, or as with the Comforting Muse, they may be a consistently worked-out motif.

[213] Claassen (1990:111-3).

However, this character must be examined as a separate entity from Ovid as it fulfils other roles and needs for Ovid than depersonalisation. Namely, it helps him with his ultimate goal while in exile: a recall to Rome or relocation to a milder place of exile, providing him with a sense of comfort and peace of mind in knowing that his "children" are working to help him, even if no one else will.

As such, the book-as-child character is explored in detail, specifically focusing on the psychological functions it performs for Ovid. This character is created through the personification of Ovid's previous and subsequent works while also using language which refers to them as his children (e.g. *Tr*. 3.1.73) or each other's siblings (e.g. *Tr*. 1.1.107) or himself as their parent (e.g. *Tr*. 3.14.11, 13).

I propose that this character serves an additional function for Ovid than just being an entity with whom he can identify and one he can depersonalise himself into, as Claassen seems to suggest. I believe it comforted him by fulfilling the human role of being his child, and striving to safeguard his interests, as he had no male children who could "avenge" him as a male child of an accused individual might do if he ever entered the senate in any way.[214] However, these works are not used to directly or emotionally comfort Ovid, as a modern reader might assume, and as his personified Comforting Muse filled this role.

The idea of personifying one's works was neither unique nor new to Ovid by the time of his exile. However, the extent to which Ovid took this anthropomorphism is considered unique to him in literature.[215] And while others, much as Martial, may have used the trope afterwards, the scope and scale of Ovid's use of this trope are unique to him. According to Claassen, Pindar is the first example of the convention of the poet personifying his poetic creations. In his *Nemean Odes* 5.2, Pindar says, "I am not a sculptor, to make statues that stand motionless on the same pedestal".[216] Ovid has a history of taking this a step further by personifying not only his books but also his talent, as seen with his Comforting Muse and Elegy itself.[217] Ovid's use of the trope of the personified poetic work can be seen as early as the epigram at the beginning of one of Ovid's first works, the *Amores,* where he personifies his set of erotic works, which speak to the reader and explain that they were once five books but have been cut down to three

---

[214] Rawson (2003:223-4).
[215] Green (2005:203).
[216] Claassen (1990:111). She seems to have used Arnson Svarlien's 1990 translation.
[217] An example of the pre-exile Ovidian personification of Elegy shows her at *Am*. 3.1.379-80 as an erotic tease. Cf. *Amores* 3.9.

by their writer (Ov. *Am*. 1. ep).[218] When speaking about his personified works as children, Ovid treats the individual scrolls as individual children but separates them by the work they create, referring to the *Ars Amatoria* (the work which led to his downfall) as three individuals on multiple occasions (*Tr*. 1.1.111, 116; 3.14.17). For example, in *Tristia* 1.1.111, he says that the reader will find three sulking in an obscure corner, later in line 116, telling the *Tristia* not to love those three though they teach how to love, and in *Tristia* 3.14.17-18, he says that three of his offspring have caught his infection, possibly referring to his banishment.

Nagle has noted Ovid furthering the concept of personifying one's works on a more complex and concrete route than others before him, like Aristotle, who compared poets to doting parents (Arist. *Eth*. *Nic*. 1168A), Propertius saying that a Muse (a work) was born of him (*a me nata Musa*, Prop. 3.1.9-10) and Quintilian who warns against treating one's work similarly to a newly born child (Quint. *Inst.* 10.4.2).[219] Martial also used Ovid's technique of talking to his book and sending it to Rome in his stead where it will meet its brothers (Mart. *Spect.* 12.3 cf. Ov. *Tr*. 1.1). According to Nagle, Ovid depicts his works as his children through the combination of personifying his poetic works and several other already established motifs, such as the poet addressing his works and the relationship between poet and work as an elder and wiser master and a youthful and naive slave.[220]

A common precursor to Ovid's father-son relationship with his book is this master-slave relationship, first seen in Horace's *Epistles* 1.20.[221] In fact, according to Nagle, *Epistles* 1.20 is not only the immediate predecessor for *Tristia* 1.1 but also its direct model.[222] However, there are substantial differences between the two, which show the difference in function between the original master-slave trope and Ovid's father-son trope. Ovid treats his books as children, viewing them hopefully as a means for salvation by sending them off to Rome in his stead, while Horace has a decidedly more negative view of the freedom-seeking actions of his book, although this negative outlook could stem from a kind of affection or protectiveness towards the book.

Horace speaks of his book as though it is a freed slave boy who desperately wants to travel and be seen, detesting having to be read privately and hidden from the public. On the other hand,

---

[218] Interestingly, Ovid uses the word *auctor* here as "author". The word can also mean "father" or "progenitor". This is possibly an early instance of Ovid personifying a work as a child.
[219] Nagle (1980:83).
[220] Nagle (1980:83).
[221] I will be using Fairclough's 1926 translation.
[222] Nagle (1980:83).

Ovid is the one desperate to be free and travel, using his work to achieve this dream vicariously. Horace's tone is decidedly negative towards the book, challenging it to leave but saying he will not take it back if it does (Hor. *Epist.* 1.20.5-6); it will only be loved (by many, a sexual innuendo) so long as it is young (Hor. *Epist.* 1.20.10) and saying he will laugh if it goes out and gets hurt, comparing the book to a stubborn donkey who is pushed off a cliff by its owner who cannot help a creature against its will (Hor. *Epist.* 1.20.14-15). Horace proclaims that he would not care if this book became a lowly schoolbook, teaching boys to read on a street corner (Hor. *Epist.* 1.20.18). However, Ovid speaks to and of his works with affection and care, begging others to grant them sanctuary in libraries and not treat them poorly for being his (*Tr.* 3.14.15-6). There are powerful sexual connotations in Horace's piece. He says the book will be well-thumbed by vulgar hands and will be cast aside once it has grown soiled (Hor. *Epist.* 1.20.11-12), whereas there are no such connotations with Ovid's works as they travel through Rome like wide-eyed children (*Tr.* 1.1; 3.1).

While the master-slave trope may seem an unlikely precursor to a parent-child trope, Horace's freed child-slave book, if it were referring to an actual human, would have fallen into a father-son relationship with his former owner, that, according to some, could have affectionate ties,[223] as was customary for the time. In ancient Rome, a freedman was to enter into two social structures with his former owner, the *clientela* and the *familia*,[224] creating a quasi-father-son relationship between the two, with the former owner being the father and the freed slave being the son.[225] Building on this, Horace could be taking on the role of a long-suffering guardian who is pretending not to care if his over-zealous ward is injured in any way to try and dissuade the ward from going out and doing whatever they please. Horace may be facetious and not malicious when he says what he says about his book-slave. To go even further, scholars such as Nagle, Davisson, Hinds, Williams, and Geyssen have all compared Horace's treatment of his book in *Epistles* 1.20 to Ovid's treatment of his books, with Hinds even commenting that Ovid's advice to his book about approaching Augustus echoes *Epistles* 1.13, signifying further Horatian influence in this field.[226] This comparison shows the differences in how authors wrote about and possibly felt about their books versus how Ovid writes about and feels about his

---

[223] Watson (1987:43).

[224] The *clientela* structure involves a *cliens,* or client, who is attached or tied to a *patronus,* or patron, a person who has greater influence or political power than the *cliens,* for the purposes of protection (*OLD*, s.v. "*cliens*" 1a); while the *familia* structure contains all the people subject to the *paterfamilias*, the male head, of the family unit. This includes relations, freedmen and slaves (*OLD,* s.v., "*familia*" 1a).

[225] Mouritsen (2011:37).

[226] Hinds (1985:13).

books. It is also a valid comparison because, more than once, Ovid refers to himself as the *dominus* (master) of his child-books, subverting the parent-child trope and reverting back to the master-slave trope seen in Horace.

However, while Ovid does use the word *dominus* to refer to himself concerning his books a few times (*Tr.* 1.1.2, 97. *Pont.* 4.9.7), he more commonly refers to himself as the works' parent, through words like *parens*[227] and *pater* (*Tr.* 3.14.11) and their cognates, saying that they were born of him in the same way Minerva was born of Jupiter (*Tr.* 3.14.13).[228] Ovid makes his works his children by making himself their father. Ovid also refers to his works more often as his children through words like *genus* (e.g., *Tr.* 3.1.73), *nasci* (e.g., *Tr.* 3.14.12, 17), *progenies* (e.g., *Tr.* 3.14.14), and *oriri* (e.g., *Pont.* 1.1.22). One of the ways Ovid personifies his works as his children is through the passing use of participles such as *natus* and infinitives such as *oriri*. These words refer to offspring or something born from Ovid but do not directly have the meaning of "child" or "children", [229] yet they do still follow the theme of having been born or spontaneously springing from Ovid, making them especially relevant in this case of works as children of a single parent (the author), falling in with the Minerva metaphor.

Ovid's personification of creative works as children is expressed in various ways and with various written works ranging from entire works to some individual poems. These characters are part of a rather elaborate metaphor which appears in several places in the texts in which these works are outwardly given a familial role but do not necessarily perform more modern familial functions, such as emotional comfort, for Ovid. Ovid does seem to treat these poems with some measure of affection and fondness, but they, especially his exilic texts, also very clearly serve a purpose which is decidedly not physical or emotional. They do not behave like children but are instead used to attempt to change the nature of Ovid's culpability and "crime", possibly to manipulate the reader positively towards Ovid's end goal of recall. Ovid tries to achieve this by placing the blame of his works on the works themselves by calling them parricides through a comparison to Oedipus and Telegonus, literary figures famous for

---

[227] *parentis* (*Tr.* 1.1.115), *parente* (*Tr.* 3.14.15).
[228] Ovid refers to Minerva through her epithet, Pallas, in this passage. In myth, Minerva was said to have sprung fully formed and coated in armour from Jupiter's head after he swallowed her pregnant mother, Metis, for fear of her producing a son who would depose him (Guerrier 2004:154).
[229] *Natus* stems from the word *nascor* which, while referring to being born (*OLD*, s.v. "*nascor*" 1a), also has connotations of coming into being or being formed when referring to inanimate things or abstract or non-material objects (*OLD,* s.v. "*nascor*" 2b, 4a). It can also refer to being produced spontaneously as opposed to having been made (*OLD,* s.v. "*nascor*" 8a). *Oriri* also refers to being born (*OLD,* s.v. "*orior*" 6a), coming into existence (*OLD,* s.v. "*orior*" 6a) or springing to life from [a parent] (*OLD,* s.v. "*orior*" 7a) but seems to have the connotation of rising up from or above (*OLD,* s.v. "*orior*" 2a cf. 3a & b cf. 4a cf. 5a cf. 8a).

unknowingly murdering their fathers (*Tr*. 1.1.114) and making them out to have some level of culpability for themselves by saying that they are the ones who taught love (*Tr*. 1.1.116) instead of Ovid teaching love through them.

Concerning interpreting how Ovid's book rolls are described, knowing that he referred to them as his children, it is necessary to look towards the treatment of children of accused individuals in ancient Rome in relation to their fathers. In Rome, children too young to provide evidence or legal support were often used in law courts to increase their father's emotional appeal should he have been charged with a crime. Cicero used Publius Sestius's son, Lucius, in this way in his defence of his father in 56 BCE. However, the emotional appeal is not entirely benevolent based on cuteness or pity. It also served as a warning to the accuser as the boy they see before them will one day become a man who, if he should join the senate in any way, would most likely begin his career by prosecuting his father's accusers.[230] Children of the accused were also displayed to the court in some cases, dressed in mourning to evoke further sympathy and pity.[231] The appearance of Ovid's book is essential because it is highly likely that Ovid was using the appearance of his books while personifying them as his children for this exact goal: to create a child in mourning who stands in the court of the accused to evoke sympathy and as a kind of threat to the accuser.[232]

While Ovid's works do not act in a childish way, I believe that they are used in the role of the child as a form of manipulation, as Ovid describes his books as needing to be seen ragged, with straggling hair (*Tr*. 1.1.12) and without ornament as befitting the book of an exile (*Tr*. 1.1.3). Ovid also refuses to polish the books as the personified work would blush if it were in a better state than its author (*Tr*. 3.1.14). He refuses to polish them physically by providing them with a finished and attractive appearance (*Tr*. 1.1.5-9, 3.1.13) and literarily, as the act of correction is too much for the exile (*Pont*. 3.9.19-20, 23). The book is deliberately described as looking unkempt (*Tr*. 1.1.12; 3.1.13) and dishevelled in an appropriate state of visible mourning (*Tr*. 1.1.6).

True to his nature, Ovid makes this book-as-child metaphor all the more complex by wishing to be his book, not only accompanying it, as both scenarios are equally impossible. Davisson

---

[230] Rawson (2003:223-4).
[231] Claassen (1990:111-2). See Besslich (1973) for a further study on the appearance of the book.
[232] As opposed to Ovid, other classical poets who describe their books, such as Catullus, Cinna and Horace, describe their books in beautiful terms. Williams links Ovid's negative description of his book in the opening lines of his first exilic poem as a kind of foreshadowing to the reader about the negative situation he is in and the mournful nature of his poems in these exilic texts (Williams 1992:181-2).

says that while this wish to be his book does express Ovid's yearning for Rome, it also suggests a more significant emotional involvement and connection with the work than shown between Horace and his work.[233] Ovid's fleeting desire to become objects is seen long before his exile.[234] However, as with Ovid's past depiction of a personified Elegy, his use of this trope had a playful and erotic context when it was used pre-exile in *Amores* 2.15, for example, when Ovid wishes to be a ring he gifts to his lover. This pre-exilic moment can be seen as Ovid's first foray into the realm of simultaneous depersonalisation and repersonification as the ring is given the human qualities which are removed from the man during the part of the poem where he speaks as though he is the ring from lines 11 to 26.[235] A major quality which is shifted from man to ring is his virility.[236] However, the context of this moment provides a definite tonal shift from playful and witty pre-exilic Ovid, writing about whimsical topics in a playful way, to an exiled Ovid trying to come to terms with his dreadful situation by writing about his terrible circumstances while still trying to infuse his old playfulness and wittiness.

Ovid's trope of depicting his works as children, or even fully personifying them into beings who can engage in activities like travelling to cities such as Rome and talking to the reader, is not a fully established trope he had formed before his exile. As such, it is not clearly established at the outset but built over time, polished through large sections of text which personify his works such as *Tristia* 1.1, 3.1, 3.7, 3.14, 5.4, and *Epistulae* 4.5, as well as through smaller, passing references which can personify the works into living creatures through the use of humanising verbs, such as *quaerunt* ("ask", *Tr.* 1.1.41) or *submovet* ("warn", *Tr.* 2.304), or through humanising nouns such as *pedes* ("feet"*, Tr.* 5.12.34). Ovid then turns his works into his children by linking them to each other as siblings through words such as *frater* ("brother", *Tr.* 1.1.107, 3.1.65) and to himself as their "parent" (*parens, Tr.* 1.1.115; 3.14.16). To demonstrate the growth of this trope, at the beginning of the first poem of the *Tristia,* it is only the first book of the *Tristia* that is fully personified, and the words first used to describe Ovid concerning it are that of the pre-established master-slave trope, *dominus* ("master", *Tr.* 1.1.2, 97). However, later in the poem, *frater* is used to refer to Ovid's other works concerning the personified *Tristia* (*Tr.* 1.1.107), signifying a familial tie. Shortly after, Ovid calls himself the

---

[233] Davisson (1984:112).

[234] See Fränkel (1945) for a look into Ovid's transient view of the self in his pre-exilic poetry. However, there appears to be a strong Christian bias.

[235] Interestingly, at the end of the poem, Ovid tells the ring to go to the girl similarly to how he tells the little book to go to Rome in *Tristia* 1.1. It is possible that Ovid had this poem from the *Amores* in mind when he wrote *Tristia* 1.1 as the themes of wanting to be the object and sending it off to do that which he cannot is repeated.

[236] Claassen (1990:103).

Tristia's "parent" (*parens Tr.* 1.1.115).[237] Thus, Ovid creates a family containing himself and his previous and current works over the course of the first poem in the *Tristia*. Notably, in *Tristia* 3.1, where the work itself speaks directly to the reader, it also uses *dominus* at first (*Tr.* 3.1.5) and later moves to *parens* (*Tr.* 3.1.57, 75) and *pater* (*Tr.* 3.1.66). The book then goes back to call him *auctor* in line 76. *Auctor* can be read as having a dual meaning in this case because it can both refer to the creator of a work and the parent of a child, creating some ambiguity, which Ovid seems to enjoy very much in his exilic texts.

Looking back over the *Tristia* and the *Epistulae*, the trope of the book-as-child can be considered relatively common in Ovidian exilic literature as it appears fully laid out in two of his exilic poems, *Tristia* 1.1 and 3.14 and is used in passing as a pre-established convention in the *Epistulae*.[238] Some examples of this reference to his works being his children in passing are when, through comparison, Ovid speaks of the works as his children, saying that nothing stops an exile's children from enjoying the city if they keep to the laws (*Pont.* 1.1.21-2). Ovid also compares Agrius and his son, Thersites, to his view of his works (*Pont.* 3.9.9-10).[239] However, it is not as common in the *Epistulae* as Ovid is far less whimsical in the *Epistulae* than in the *Tristia*.[240]

In *Tristia* 1.1, Ovid ascribes blame to his *Ars* (*Tr.* 1.1.111-2), telling the *Tristia* to call the three scrolls parricides like Oedipus and Telegonous (*Oedipodas facito Telegonosque voces* "give them the names of Oedipus or of Telegonous", *Tr.* 1.1.113-4), individuals who both killed their fathers albeit unwittingly. Later, in *Tristia* 3.1, Ovid separates his good children from his bad ones, trying to persuade those who come across his exilic works to give them a chance while they plead his case, with the book itself begging the reader not to shun it as not a line of its pages teach of love (*Tr.* 3.1.3-4).

Ovid uses his books as his children who speak for him to shift or diminish the blame placed on him for his *crimen* as his work refers to him as "wretched" (*miser, Tr.* 3.1.73) rather than guilty and admonishes Augustus for his exile of Ovid in a roundabout way by calling the emperor "harsh" (*asper, Tr.* 3.1.75). In *Tristia* 1.1, the book is not to physically defend Ovid (*Tr.* 1.1.25)

---

[237] There is no way to tell if this was the first poem Ovid wrote or if he wrote this one later and decided to put it first as an introduction, so it cannot be known if this building of the trope was intentional or not. It could be a kind of origin story for the trope as he uses it more concretely in other poems in *Tristia* 1.

[238] Claassen (1990:111).

[239] Thersites was an ugly Greek at the Trojan War whom Achilles killed for mocking his grief over a warrior princess called Penthesilea.

[240] Davisson (1984:113).

but rather to wait for Augustus's wrath to subside (*Tr*. 1.1.94) and then go to him to ease Ovid's distress (*Tr*. 1.1.98-8), presumably by either winning Ovid's recall or a new location of exile. Thus, they seem to fulfil an active comforting role in fighting for him where he cannot, providing him with the voice in Rome that he cannot have. In this work, Ovid instructs his book to go back to Rome in his stead as his ambassador to inform his loved ones of his situation and plead his case to Augustus in an attempt to be recalled, a goal from which Ovid never truly divorced himself.

Ovid uses his works to try and garner sympathy from whomever he can in his attempt at recall. This goal of manipulation is made clear in *Tristia* 3.1, in which the poem speaks to the reader as opposed to Ovid speaking to the book in *Tristia* 1.1, as the poem asks the "kind reader" (*lector amice*) to "lend a hand" (*do… manum*) to Ovid (*Tr*. 3.1.2). It suggests that its poor quality is to be blamed on the situation in which the writer finds himself (*Tr*. 3.1.17-8), implying that if Ovid were to be brought back to Rome, or even just closer to Rome, as he often asks, his work would regain its quality. This would be in the reader's best interest if they genuinely care about him. This can be interpreted as a manipulative tactic,[241] which indicates Ovid's increasing desperation to return home. From *Tristia* 3.14.11 onwards, for the rest of the poem, Ovid again makes use of the parent-child trope in a manipulative or bargaining way, begging the recipient of the poem, a patron and possible friend, to become the guardian of his works in Rome (*Tr*. 3.14.16), bar the three troublesome children, the *Ars*, who have caught his infection (*Tr*. 3.14.17). This could be considered an attempt by Ovid to ensure that a piece of him returns to Rome as, in the *Metamorphoses*, Ovid says that through his books, his legacy will live on forever (Ov. *Met*. 15.871-9) or as an attempt for Ovid to live vicariously through his books, wishing to be them, as seen in *Tristia* 1.

Interestingly, Ovid makes less and less use of the book-child trope through his exilic texts, only using it in passing in his *Epistulae*. Instead, he moves on to another kind of manipulation tactic in this text, which is far more suited to the more personal tone of the letter-based poetry in

---

[241] Ovid makes use of various kinds of manipulation in his goal to receive relief from the effects of exile. He degrades Augustus and implies that his friends do not care about him if they are not willing to help him. Ovid also frequently uses "love bombing" as a manipulative tactic, especially in the *Epistulae*. Love bombing is a kind of manipulation that involves lavishing someone with attention or affection to influence or persuade them. Finally, Ovid uses classic emotional manipulation in which he performs or exaggerates his negative emotions and situation when expressing them to the target in an attempt to garner sympathy or pity from them, which he needs in order to achieve his goal. Manipulation as a concept is vast and it is difficult to break down and determine specific aspects of individual instances of it. Most people can intuitively identify manipulation and as such, there is a great discourse and differing opinions on theory regarding manipulation. See Coons & Weber (2014) for more information on the theory and practice of manipulation.

which he speaks to individuals instead of simply writing poetry to be sent back. This could be due to Ovid no longer needing to speak about his earlier works after the years spent in exile, or he was attempting to be more candid about his *carmen*.[242] Davisson suggests that Ovid's joking about Thersites and his insistence on his good judgement are reasons for the reader not to take Ovid's apologies for the quality of his work seriously.[243] However, just mentioning the quality of his work in a negative light is indicative of an internal fear Ovid has of his Muse leaving him, as he tries to convey repeatedly in the *Epistulae*. Another possible reason is that Ovid assumes the reader already knows the parent-child trope and how Ovid relates it to his exilic works and thus feels no need to emphasize the metaphor further.

The Book-as-Child character set, created through the use of personification, serves to comfort Ovid, not in the way the Comforting Muses do, but instead is used in a way that would attempt to make the reader sympathetic to both his situation and his works, ensuring a lasting legacy through them and a possibility of being recalled or relocated to a more congenial place of exile. Here, again, the notion of personification used to soften the sense of loneliness he feels in his time of severe isolation is present. This aligns with the conclusion outlined in the SEEK model of Anthropomorphism.

3.4   Conclusion

Through personification, it can be seen that Ovid creates characters, namely the Comforting Muses and the Book-as-Child character set, which fulfil many roles for him. While the Comforting Muses fulfil the role of close and intimate friends, they also sometimes appear in their traditional roles as inspiring deities. In their role as the creators of his works, Ovid can shift some of the blame for his exile onto them for moments of reprieve from these emotions. Additionally, Ovid has a conflicting view of them as both the reason for his downfall and the only salve to his wounds. His Book-as-Child characters do not directly comfort Ovid in the way the Comforting Muses do and instead are used to make the reader, and hopefully Augustus himself, sympathetic towards Ovid to help him gain recall. They also ensure Ovid's lasting legacy, essentially immortalising the concept of him. However, Ovid also has an ambivalent view of some of his works, calling the *Ars* "parricides", implying they have some kind of responsibility for causing Ovid's exile. The psychological component of the roles they fulfil as unconscious coping mechanisms is that their existence helps him cope, in various ways, with

---

[242] Davisson (1984:113).
[243] Davisson (1984:113).

being exiled. Both of these characters are written to have close bonds with Ovid, although each one has a different kind of bond with him. The Comforting Muse is more of a companion, while the book acts on Ovid's behalf in the way the child or children of an accused individual might. However, over time, he refers to them less and less. This is more prevalent with his books than with his Muse, showing Ovid's loss of hope and whimsicality. Regardless of the ambivalence with which Ovid views these characters, as they are so intricately linked to the cause of his exile, they were likely specifically created to comfort him in his time of need in Pontus.

Chapter 4: Depersonalisation and repersonification

4.1   Introduction

The other main technique used by Ovid to (unconsciously) express the trauma of his exile is depersonalisation and then a subsequent repersonification of the now-depersonalised non-humans. To reiterate, when faced with extreme isolation and loneliness, humans are known to anthropomorphise as a means to cope with their new situation psychologically.[244] The antithesis of this process is known as dehumanization. Epley et al. propose that dehumanisation can be understood using a similar model to their anthropomorphism model, stating that dehumanization is likely to happen when an individual sees no future outcome in which they will either interact with or want to understand a target group of people, implying some kind of psychological or spatial remove from these target individuals.[245] Moreover, Claassen proposes, in her 1990 article, that Ovid's loss of identity, seen in the final book of the *Epistulae*, through consistent depersonalisation, can be viewed as a typical symptom of, or reaction to, the psychological effects of loneliness and long-term isolation.[246] While these two theories are different to a degree, and Claassen does not use any psychological perspective to back up her supposition, the overall proposition is that Ovid depersonalises because he has experienced a traumatic spatial or psychological remove from others. In particular, Ovid depersonalises himself and others into body parts, human concepts, animals, objects, and other non-human concepts, such as gods. He also creates two major characters through depersonalisation and simultaneous repersonification, the Augustus-Jupiter and Pontus characters.

4.2   Body parts and human concepts (Agency-based depersonalisations)

The most common way Ovid uses depersonalisation (and repersonification) is through agency-based depersonalisation. Before his exile, Ovid was no stranger to the concept of literary depersonalisation, a process whereby a person's humanity is removed or changed. Ovid retells myths involving antiprosopopoeia, the pure literary form of depersonalisation without any psychological underpinnings, extensively in his *Metamorphoses,* whose characters' forms are changed in all manner of ways by gods and other immortal beings for various reasons, such as Callisto, who was transformed into a bear by Juno for attracting Jupiter's attention (Ov. *Met.*

---

[244] Epley et al. (2007:864).
[245] Epley et al. (2007:880).
[246] Claassen (1990:115).

2.443-508), and Scylla who was transformed into a terrifying sea monster by Circe due to jealousy (Ov. *Met*. 8.17-104). Claassen notes that Ovid also makes use of this kind of depersonalisation in his *Amores* 2.15, where Ovid wishes that he could become a ring that is given to his female lover. Ovid depersonalises himself into the ring while retaining the most relevant human quality: his virility. Claassen aptly notes that two actions occur in this instance: the ring itself is personified, while the lover who wishes to become the ring is depersonalised.[247]

However, the depersonalisation in Ovid's exilic literature is very different to the depersonalisation with which his readers were previously familiar. The depersonalisation of the lover into a ring is whimsical and playful. Similarly, in the *Metamorphoses,* depersonalisation takes on a fantastical feeling as the technique is used to tell stories that, while often gruesome and cruel, are filled with wonder and magic. Conversely, the depersonalisation in Ovid's exilic literature serves to emphasize the level of isolation and loneliness Ovid feels in his exile. There is no magic used to depersonalise the individuals in the exilic texts, as Ovid is the poet who depersonalises them, not any god or powerful immortal figure. A reason for this could be that the *Metamorphoses* is meant to be read as a story presented by a narrator, while the exilic poems are meant to be read as being directly expressed by the author to a recipient in a letter format sent back home from the edge of the earth. The type of whimsy seen in Ovid's depersonalisations in the *Metamorphoses* is also visible in Ovid's self-depersonalisation in the *Amores* as Ovid, the writer, depersonalises himself but to a different end. He is being facetious at this moment, playfully wishing to be closer to his love than he can actually be (Ov. *Am*. 2.15), while in the exilic texts, Ovid's depersonalisation typically takes on a darker tone as it is used to assuage negative feelings and represents a loss of identity for Ovid.

When regarding Ovidian depersonalisations, agency-based depersonalisation is by far the most common of the various Ovidian depersonalisations if one counts each case separately from one another, and it is present throughout his exilic poetry. However, Ovid uses agency-based interpersonal depersonalisation much more in the *Tristia* than in the *Epistulae ex Ponto*. This is odd as one would expect this kind of depersonalisation to be far more frequent in the *Epistulae ex Ponto* as he is talking directly to people, often about themselves, to gain their aid in his pleas for clemency. The reason for the comparatively high amounts of agency-based interpersonal depersonalisation seen in the exilic texts could be that, cognitively and poetically,

---

[247] Claassen (1990:103).

it is easier to use agency-based depersonalisation than Metaphorical or Complex depersonalisation. This is because this kind of depersonalisation requires less effort over time in constructing characters and scenarios. These scenarios and characters require less cognitive effort for a higher immediate poetic impact. This technique allows for a more whimsical, plastic way of writing while creating more personified entities than a metaphorical or complex depersonalisation spanning several works or poems.

Ovid uses agency-based depersonalisation to create characters by removing autonomy from himself and others and placing the burden of autonomy on, most commonly, personified body parts. There may sometimes be metaphor or metonymy involved, but it is not necessary to create this trope, as it is a very simple trope in concept and practice. While using a part of the whole to represent a whole is a typical poetic device, the cases of intrapersonal depersonalisation still count towards mental depersonalisation of the self as they allow Ovid to shift his feelings and behaviours onto things which, while linked to him, are not him as a person. This allows him both an outsider's view and some respite from the feelings and the consequences of the behaviours. These intrapersonal depersonalisations also fulfil his need to have others to interact with, as the process of simple depersonalisation involves simultaneous depersonalisation and repersonification. Conversely, his interpersonal depersonalisations are used mainly to compliment his loved ones, probably in hopes of them helping him with his goal of recall.

It would seem that Ovid's loved ones and peers receive a significant amount of attention from the poet when it comes to agency-based interpersonal depersonalisation, and this depersonalisation is typically positive, with Ovid praising these individuals through these depersonalisations. Ovid writes, for example, that an unnamed friend's "shoulders" (*umeris*) h "supported" (*fulta*) his ruin (*Tr.* 5.13.8). The most likely reason for the continued positivity towards his friends is that Ovid is hoping that one of them earns him clemency with Augustus or, after his death, a member of his family. This is seen through his early references to his friends possibly one-day winning his recall or relocation (*Tr.* 4.9.3), his numerous instances of begging for his friends to plead his case to the emperor or the emperor's family (*Pont.* 4.8.89-90, 9.130, 10.76-80, 12.49-50, 13.41-8, 15.23-4) and references to how sweet life would be if he were away from Pontus (*Pont.* 4.14.61-2) as well as his constant begging for recall or relocation being acknowledged by the poet himself (*Pont.* 4.15.29).

The concept of simple depersonalisation is not unique to Ovid. Other elegiac poets have moments of simple depersonalisation, but these are relatively few and far between when

compared to Ovid's frequency of depersonalisation in his exilic texts, specifically his self-depersonalisation in his exilic texts. The others seem to depersonalise others rather than themselves more regularly. This is seen in Propertius and Catullus,[248] who focus on the hands and eyes more than the mouth and tongue.[249] Of these two authors, Propertius uses hand- and eye-based depersonalisations most. Propertius uses hand-based depersonalisations several times[250] but only refers to the hands as being his hands twice (Prop. 3.23, 42).[251] This trend is repeated with the eyes as Propertius uses eye-based depersonalisations a handful of times in his works[252] but only directly refers to the eyes as his eyes four times (Prop. 1.19; 2.15, 22; 3.21). It is possible that the reason for his interest in these body parts is given in 2.12, where he writes that if he is destroyed, "who will sing of my sweetheart's face, her hands, her dark eyes, and how daintily her footsteps fall?" The mention of these body parts as integral parts of the people he writes about can explain why he refers to them so much, as he sees describing these features of his subjects as an integral part of the act of writing poetry but does not explain the depersonalisation (Prop. 2.12). Propertius may often use parts to represent the whole in instances like this to portray a more poetic atmosphere in his writing. Surprisingly, Catullus, Propertius and Tibullus give very little attention to the tongue and mouth. It would make sense for elegiac poets to focus on these body parts as they are so linked to love and eroticism, yet they receive very little depersonalisation from the poets. The poets do not ignore the body parts. However, they are not personified by ascribing another's agency to them. In the case of depersonalising the self, it is possible that since these poets were not experiencing the same continuous turmoil as Ovid, they felt very little need to depersonalise themselves. And, in the case of depersonalising others, their lack of depersonalisation may be due to the close connection they felt to the individuals to whom they were referring. Instead of feeling the need

---

[248] Catullus uses eye-based depersonalisations a handful of times but only openly describes the eyes as being his twice (Catull. 63.56, 68B.55; Mulroy, D. [trans., 2002]). The other eye-based depersonalisations can be found at: 45.11-2; 63.48; 64.220, and 64.242. Catullus also makes rare use of the hand-based depersonalisation, using it sparingly but never in relation to himself (Catull. 64.310-2, 314; 68.20, 92, 143). Unlike Propertius, Catullus provides the reader with no real indication as to why he does this. However, given how infrequent this is in his works, it is possible that he saw no need to elaborate on why he would write about these things if he did not specifically focus on them to the same degree as Propertius.

[249] Propertius is the only one of the three elegiac poets who depersonalises anyone into their mouth at all, doing it twice (1.5.1; 4.8.7; Dennis, R. G. & Putnam C. J. [trans., 2012]) but he never depersonalises himself into a mouth. Catullus does depersonalise others into their tongues a few times but never himself (7.12; 108.3-4). Propertius is more willing to depersonalise himself into his tongue, doing it three times (1.16.37-8; 2.19.31; 4.4.52) of the total number of times he depersonalises individuals into a tongue (2.32.25; 3.8A.11; 3.13.66). Tibullus only once depersonalises anyone, himself, into a tongue (1.2.82).

[250] These depersonalisations are seen in Prop. 1.6.16; 2.4.8, 6.27, 12.9, 27.8, 33B.26; 3.7.30, 8A.4, 11.68, 16.6, 22.8, 22, 25.10; 4.2.26, 3.6, 24, 4.22, 5.53, 6.22, 7.12.

[251] For the purposes of this and the following instances, I have used Katz's [1960] 2004 translation.

[252] These depersonalisations are seen in Prop. 1.15.40; 2.1.11, 6.29, 15.12, 23, 22A.7, 25.40, 32.10; 4.8.66.

to depersonalise the individuals they are writing about into their body parts, they are personified to create entities for a psychological coping mechanism. For each individual body part or aspect of existence, Ovid seems to match the individual poets in frequency or even come below them, but none of Ovid's peers match Ovid overall in frequency as Ovid makes far more use of this technique than the others do across multiple body parts.

Although Ovid personifies many parts of the body, the parts which receive the most extensive agency are his own eyes, his and others' tongues, mouths, voices, and hands. One possible reason for this is that these are the tools of Ovid's trade as a poet, and as such, he feels more connected to them as he uses them as modes for his craft and self-expression. However, looking at other elegiac poets, this interest could also be linked to the subject matter he was used to creating and consuming before the exile, as depersonalisation of this kind was neither novel nor infrequent.

Concerning his "eyes" (*oculi*),[253] Ovid writes that, sadly, his eyes will never "see" (*videnda Tr.* 1.3.32) the temples of Rome again and are "looking back (*respiciens Tr.* 1.3.60) towards his loved ones. Later, while referring to his youth, Ovid writes that his eyes were "entertained" (*Morata, Tr.* 2.344) by letters when he was young. In this instance, Ovid could be trying to move his culpability to his eyes as he writes it to seem as though it were they who were interested in writing and poetry. About a portion of the charge against him, the *error,* his eyes were "unknowing" (*inscia, Tr.* 3.5.49-50) and saw an offence. Again, here, Ovid is altering his culpability by employing his eyes; however, in this section, he seems to defend them by implying there was no malicious intent in their actions. The letter of Celsus's death was read by Ovid's "unwilling" (*invitis, Pont.* 1.9.4) eyes, and later they "miss" (*desunt, Pont.* 2.8.17) the Palace in Rome. When depersonalising himself into his eyes, Ovid almost exclusively refers to times when he was in Rome in terms which suggest how much he misses Rome. This tendency could be an early signifier of Ovid having a tendency for escapism into things which remind him of or allow him to escape mentally to Rome.

Moving down the face to arguably the most important aspects of Ovid's poetic career, his tongue, mouth and voice. When Ovid falls sick at the beginning of book three of the *Tristia*, his "tongue" (*lingua*) can barely be "revived" (*restituenda, Tr.* 3.3.21-2) by wine and it later "denies" (*negat, Tr.* 3.3.87) Ovid the power to dictate to the individual writing the poem for

---

[253] When there are multiple instances of a noun being depersonalised, the noun will be stated in its nominative form. However, when there is only one instance, it will be in the form in which it is found in the text.

him. Here, Ovid's tongue is the one in charge of Ovid, deciding whether or not he can speak to the people back in Rome. Ovid's tongue is later asked to be "favourable" (*favens, Tr*. 5.5.5) and "forgetful" (*oblita, Tr*. 5.5.5) of his troubles and is feared to have "unlearned" (*dedidicit, Tr*. 5.5.6) propitious speech. In the *Epistulae ex Ponto,* Ovid's tongue is described as having "hurried" (*properante, Pont.* 3.5.9) through clever speeches. Ovid's tongue is told to "be silent" (*sile! Pont.* 2.2.59) about the nature of his *error*, as he might have been ordered not to speak of it. This deduction can be drawn when assessing the fact that he never elaborates on his *error* in any way apart from stating that he saw something he should not have seen (*Tr*. 2.103). In reference to the charge which led to his exile, his tongue never "spoke" (*loquendo, Tr.* 3.5.47-8) impious words while drunk. Again, Ovid is seen advocating for himself by insinuating that his error was not malicious or intentional.

One of Ovid's favoured types of agency-based interpersonal depersonalisation of friends and loved ones is depersonalising the individual into their tongue. Brutus's tongue is described as attacking enemies with sharp weapons like missiles (*Pont.* 4.6.36), and Maximus's tongue is skilled, and its practised sweetness should soften Augustus (*Pont.* 1.2.117-8). While the use of the word tongue in this context can be seen as metaphorical, as he is speaking about the oratory or poetic skill of the people he is depersonalising, the metaphor itself is not complex. Each instance does not make up a significant portion of the text, build up a character such as the Augustus-Jupiter character, or create a set convention such as the Ovid-as-a-ship depersonalisation, which is expanded upon throughout the exilic texts. These depersonalisations seem to serve a single function: praising the recipient of the poem, who is the one who is being depersonalised, in hopes of them using these praised skills to further Ovid's efforts for recall or relocation.

Moving even lower down the face to the "mouth" (*os*), when Ovid wishes to say his possible final farewell, it is his mouth that "speaks" (*dictum, Tr.* 3.3.87-8) and it is his mouth which "drank" (*bibi, Tr*. 3.5.14) Carus's tears. He later writes that it has never caused any living person to be "wounded" (*saucius, Pont.* 4.14.44) in defence of himself having a pure heart. Similar to the tongue is the voice (*vox*). However, it is a relatively minor personified part of Ovid's body and existence. Ovid depersonalises himself into his voice which is "tired" (*fessa*) of speech when he is dictating to another from his sickbed (*Tr.* 3.3.85). Ovid claims that his voice does not "lie" (*mentitura, Tr.* 4.3.16) and is never "silent" (*muta*) about his wife (*Tr.*

5.14.17). Later, Ovid's voice "seeks" (*temptat, Pont.* 3.9.42)[254] help from his many friends. With these mouth-based depersonalisations, there is a recurring trend of Ovid attempting to either shift the culpability of his *error* or defend himself against his charges. Ovid's attempts to eulogise himself can be seen as him standing in the court of public opinion, begging those around him to help him plead his case.

Ovid often depersonalises himself and others into their hand or hands. He depersonalises himself into his own hands by writing that his hands are performing the actions that he is. There are frequent instances of this. For example, Ovid's hands were "reluctant" (*invita, Pont.* 4.1.14) to remove Pompey's name from the wax seal of the letter. And later, Ovid's hands must now, sadly, "perform" (*fungitur, Pont.* 4.9.11-2) greetings with written words. In these references, there is a positive outlook on Rome and things related to it, although this is often expressed through negative means as, for example, Ovid is reluctant to remove Pompey's name from a letter, thereby removing a link between himself and Rome. In reference to the charge against him and in defence of himself, Ovid writes that his hands did not "mix" (*mixtave, Pont.* 2.9.68) any lethal poison. This harkens back to the mouth-based depersonalisations which Ovid used to defend himself against the charge against him, but he makes far less use of this defence technique with his hands than with concepts or parts related to the mouth. Linked to the hands are the fingers, and later in the *Epistulae ex Ponto*, when Ovid begins to lose inspiration to write, he writes that his "fingers" (*digitis*) rarely "draw" (*ducitur, Pont.* 4.2.24)[255] letters any more. Ovid's depersonalisation of himself into his hands could be because of how closely linked they are to his craft, creating a perfect way for him to write about his craft and the act of writing, which he does often. This could have been because he was running out of real-life subject matter to write about but still felt a yearning to write.

Regarding depersonalising others into their hands, Ovid writes that the hands of his loved ones "beat" (*feriunt, Tr.* 1.3.78) on naked breasts on the night of his departure from Rome. This could be an attempt to illustrate to the reader how loved Ovid was by those who cared about him, possibly in an attempt to manipulate those who read the work back in Rome to join in Ovid's mission for recall or relocation. In another instance, Ovid writes that his and his friend's hands must now perform the acts of tongues (*Tr.* 5.13.30). This seems to be wistful, as if Ovid is lightly lamenting the fact that he cannot speak to the friend in person, which he would be

---

[254] *OLD* 2, s.v. "*tempto*" 7a (Glare 2012).
[255] *OLD* 2, s.v. "*duco*" 20a (Glare 2012).

able to do if he were recalled, and instead they are forced to hold a conversation through writing in place of speaking to one another as they used to. This could be an attempt at manipulation as there is a slight implication that if Ovid were there in person, which the friend could make a reality if they pled his case, they would not need to write and could speak to one another. This, however, is a reference to hands as a depersonalisation made in passing and noticeably metaphorical in nature, but it does not reach the level of metaphorical interpersonal depersonalisation as it is not complex enough to achieve the rank.

The reason for the almost overuse of depersonalisation into these parts could be because Ovid seems to view these body parts and aspects of existence as rather expressive of emotion, and thus, it is easier for him to express his emotions through them as opposed to his "feet" (*pes*), for example, which deliberately slowed down (*tardus, Tr.* 1.3.56) to match his intent on the night he departed from Rome. Ovid also personifies the abovementioned body parts through the use of human adjectives like "timid" (*timidae, Pont.* 2.8.75), "mournful" (*lugubres, Tr.* 1.8.23), "terrified" (*attonitas, Pont.* 2.3.90), "weary" (*languida, Pont.* 3.3.8) and "anxious" (*sollicito, Pont.* 4.9.130) to describe body parts such as his "mind" (*mentis*), "face" (*vultus*), "cheeks" (*genas*), "limbs" (*membra*), and "mouth"(*ore*), respectively. These last few instances are all passing references that make up a small portion of Ovid's self-depersonalisation but are important because they show an unwillingness to accept responsibility for his actions or his emotions.

As seen above with the depersonalisation of himself into his voice, Ovid also sometimes uses more abstract concepts instead of body parts to depersonalise himself. These concepts are intrinsically linked to physical aspects of human lived experience, such as the mind, senses, and other similar concepts more strongly linked to the cerebral aspects of human existence. Ovid depersonalises himself into his "spirit" (*animus*) and supports Augustus (*Tr.* 2.55); this sentiment is repeated when he writes that his spirit shows favour to Augustus and his family by "singing" (*canam*; *Tr.* 2.562). In these instances, Ovid could be trying to gain sympathy from either Augustus or those strongly aligned with him. Ovid's "mind" (*mensque*) still "holds" (*habet, Tr.* 4.6.22) the emotions of his recent troubles. This psychological tinge is echoed when he writes that his (psychological) "wounds" (*vulnera*) "fear" (*timent, Pont.* 1.6.22) to be touched. However, when referring to Rome and the people in it, Ovid's "mind" (*mens*) could not be "held" (*teneri, Pont.* 4.1.7) from gratitude and can only "grasp" (*capitur, Pont.* 4.9.37-8) at the pleasure of being back in Rome.

Another aspect of the mind is one's judgement. Ovid depersonalises himself into his judgement a few times, writing that his "judgement" (*iudicio*)[256] had always "loved" (*amata, Tr*. 4.10.40) safe seclusion. His judgement is personified again later when Ovid writes that his judgement[257] has never "wounded" (*laesa, Tr*. 5.3.54) a book. Ovid's judgement is personified a third time, albeit stemming from a different Latin word, *sententia*, when Ovid writes that his judgement was "unsure" (*dubia, Pont.* 3.4.87) which metre to use. In the second instance, two entities are created from concepts, as Ovid's judgement and the hypothetical book are personified. He simultaneously depersonalises himself and personifies his "senses" (*sensus*), which begin to "revive" (*convaluere, Tr*. 1.3.14) and "wake" (*vigilare, Pont.* 3.3.94). He also depersonalises himself into his "skill" (*ingenio*) which brought him punishment (*Tr*. 2.342). While concepts such as Ovid's skill are more complex to depersonalise oneself into than body parts, they still fulfil the same function. It could even be argued that they are more important because of their ability to take on the agency of Ovid's more complex emotions and actions. He can write about his feelings and actions in a more abstract yet more precise way, as these concepts are far more closely related to the actions and emotions they are taking on. A good comparison is Ovid's depersonalisation of himself into his feet, which slow down to match his intent versus his tastes, which loved safe seclusion. In both of these cases, Ovid is referring to complex ideas such as the unwillingness to leave Rome and the idea of his desired life in the shade, but the second one can far more concretely express the concept than the first because the concept which Ovid is depersonalising himself into gives him more room to play.

To a far lesser extent than the abovementioned instances, Ovid sometimes places the autonomy of his actions on external concepts which are not aspects of the human lived experience. An example of Ovid depersonalising himself into an external concept is seen in *Tristia* 1.1.107-8, where it is not Ovid who crafted his other works but the study of poetry or possibly elegy itself. Examples of these are very few and far between and form a miniscule portion of Ovid's agency-based depersonalisation. This could be because human body parts feel more human to him than abstract concepts, and thus, he would rather have personified body parts surrounding him than just objects and concepts. This is also seen in Ovid's lesser treatment of concepts related to human existence, such as a spirit or mind, as opposed to physical body parts.

---

[256] *OLD* 2, s.v. "*iudicium*" 11a (Glare 2012).
[257] *OLD* 2, s.v. "*iudicium*" 9a (Glare 2012).

While Ovid's depersonalisations of himself are fraught with negative connotations, his depersonalisations of loved ones and his readers are often shown in a positive light. Ovid depersonalises his wife several times in his exilic texts, especially in the *Tristia*. While depersonalisation may seem to be an adverse action as one is taking away the agency or humanity from an individual, Ovid typically depersonalises her in a positive way. And at first, there is very little of the manipulative colouring evident with his other loved ones. At first, Ovid writes that tears fall over her "guiltless cheeks" (*indignas… genas, Tr*. 1.3.18). Later in the *Tristia*, Ovid seems to become anxious about his wife's feelings towards him, wondering if she still cares for him (*Tr*. 4.3.10). Dictating to a writer from his supposed deathbed, Ovid asks if she will strike her "faithful breast" (*pectora fida, Tr*. 3.3.48) with a trembling hand upon hearing of his death. In this case, Ovid's wife retains the agency to strike her breast, but the quality of faithfulness to Ovid is ascribed to her breast, removing some of her agency while not entirely removing all agency from her. In *Tristia* 4.3, when Ovid's anxieties about his wife seem to reach a head, he asks whether sleep leaves her "gentle" (*lenis*) breast when her "suffering mind broods" (*incubit… mens aegra, Tr*. 4.3.21-2) over her just grievance and if "weary bones" (*fessaque… ossa, Tr*. 4.3.26) ache in her troubled body and later, when musing over his death in Pontus, he writes that if he were not exiled, it would have been her fingers which would have "closed" (*texissent, Tr*. 4.3.43-4) his eyes upon his death.

Through these depersonalisations, Ovid expresses his doubt over her continued feelings towards him, but he does not bring it up in the context of a plea for recall or relocation, instead as an anxious exiled husband doubting his wife's loyalty to him. The last instance of depersonalisation of his wife from Ovid in the *Tristia* is exceptionally simple yet indicative of his anxieties regarding their relationship. He asks her if she grows pale at a letter from him reaching her and asks if she opens the letter with "anxious" (*sollicita, Tr*. 5.2.1-2) hands, signifying Ovid's fear that she does not enjoy letters from her husband as her face grows pale when she receives them. It could be possible that Ovid is projecting his own insecurities onto his wife in this scenario, as he has clearly been growing anxious about his relationship with her. He could be projecting those negative emotions onto her instead of coming to terms and dealing with them as his own emotions. The final depersonalisation of Ovid's wife is seen in book three of the *Epistulae ex Ponto,* where Ovid says to Livia what Ovid's wife's mouth needs to "pray" (*precanda, Pont*. 3.1.114), in reference to a plea for clemency for Ovid. In this poem we find the only instances Ovid depersonalises his wife concerning a plea for recall or relocation, which indicates how desperate he has become as he has had no problem

depersonalising his other loved ones concerning pleas for clemency before this. Ovid makes use of various types of agency-based depersonalisation when referencing his wife. Ovid sometimes uses simple descriptive words such as *indignus*, *fidus* and *sollicitus* to describe her body parts instead of her and sometimes engages in a more complex style of agency-based depersonalisation by ascribing physical agency to body parts instead of his wife. Notably, these depersonalisations never seem malicious or negative, especially in the beginning, and almost always seem to serve an outwardly poetic function, adding a layer of artfulness and whimsy over a difficult situation. Although he later depersonalises her slightly negatively, these anxieties and resulting depersonalisations come from a place of love and positivity, which is slightly marred by doubt and anxiety. It could be that Ovid does not want his wife to feel these negative emotions about him and, as such, ascribes these hypothetical negative emotions to her body parts instead of her, allowing himself to protect his mental image of her.

Ovid only depersonalises his readers a handful of times, and his depersonalisations typically perform an outwardly poetic function related to the enjoyment of literature. The reader he is depersonalising is typically the hypothetical person reading the work about which he is talking. Ovid makes one reference to poetry concerning hands when, in the *Tristia*, the poem tells ordinary hands to "take it up" (*sumite, Tr.* 3.1.81-2), referring to the hands of the readers. Other sensory organs involved in poetry are the ears and eyes. Ovid writes that a book brings many things to "delight the ear" (*mulcendis auribus*, *Tr.* 2.357-8) and later writes an epitaph for the hurried eyes of passers-by to "read" (*legat*, *Tr.* 3.3.71). Each of these depersonalisations is about a part of the body that is integral to the participation in or enjoyment of poetry: the hands, eyes and ears. It is likely that Ovid outwardly used these depersonalisations for poetic flair, but they could have also played a psychological role for him as he can distance himself emotionally from the readers whom he so dearly misses, thinking of them in a disjointed way, reducing the pain he feels at being exiled and separated from their direct participation and feedback. It is also noteworthy that in each of these instances, a non-human is being repersonified by being ascribed agency while the human is being simultaneously depersonalised, so there is no loss in the net number of entities with which Ovid can interact.

Ovid's treatment of enemies and former friends through agency-based interpersonal depersonalisation is quite slim in the exilic texts, which is strange as one could assume that he would want these people to "not exist" far more than people such as his friends, wife, and readers. It is possible that his third exilic text, the *Ibis*, fulfilled his need to dehumanize or take out his anger on people who had negatively influenced his life as it is a scathing invective. This

would make sense as there are relatively few poems in the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto* which deal with enemies, and when he does refer to them, they generally remain unnamed, so it is unsure whether he was dealing with a single individual who had done some significant wrong against him or if he was dealing with several individuals. Ovid refers to one former friend within this category, stating that his tender "palate" (*palato, Tr.* 1.8.43-4) drained a tigress' udders. Referring to any male Roman citizen's body parts as "tender" (*tener*), implying that he is soft or delicate, could be seen as an insult, especially as the word used, tener, also means an individual being immature,[258] weak or effeminate.[259] Ovid calls the heart of one unnamed enemy "greedy" (*avido; Tr.* 3.11.58) and, in the same poem, tells them to take their "unfeeling" (*duras, Tr.* 3.11.64)[260] hands from his deep wounds. In this poem, the enemy is someone who exults in Ovid's exile. He describes them as being born of rock (*Tr.* 3.11.3) and that their heart is made of stone (*Tr.* 3.11.4). Ovid writes that the individual has a thirst for blood (*Tr.* 3.11.57), much like an animal would. This is a poem that delves deeper into Ovid's feelings towards this unnamed enemy than others in this section, as the entire poem is dedicated to them, all of the depersonalisations are negative, and Ovid uses them to remove the humanity from the individual without much simultaneous repersonification, showing the strength of his negative emotions for them. The final depersonalisation against people who have influenced his life negatively is seen in *Tristia* 5.11, where Ovid writes that the person's mouth calls him *exul* instead of *relegatus* (*Tr.* 5.11.29). This seems to deeply bother Ovid as he addresses the individual directly at the end of the poem, telling them to stop burdening his fate with the lying name of exile. This is a strange phrase to become enraged at as Ovid calls himself an exile several times (*Tr.* 1.1.3; 3.1.1; 4.1.3; 5.9.6. *Pont.* 1.1.65; 2.6.3).

Apart from depersonalising people with whom he is familiar, Ovid sometimes uses agency-based depersonalisations metaphorically to explain himself better or get the point across in a more fleshed-out way. These depersonalisations involve the removal of humanity from a hypothetical or metaphorical person. This type of depersonalisation happens a few times in the *Tristia* but mostly takes place in the *Epistulae ex Ponto*. In many of these cases, the metaphors containing the depersonalisation are linked to Ovid as he uses them to illustrate his situation and feelings. In the *Tristia*, Ovid says that whoever sets out to commit arson will provide his "bold" (*audaces, Tr.* 2.267-8) hands with fire in reference to objects, concepts and phenomena

---

[258] *OLD* 2, s.v. "*tener*" 2a (Glare 2012).
[259] *OLD* 2, s.v. "*tener*" 7a (Glare 2012).
[260] *OLD* 2, s.v. "*durus*" 4a (Glare 2012).

that can help while also having the ability to harm. He uses this metaphor to defend his poetry, saying it was not intended to cause harm. Later, in a passage linked to the Augustus-Jupiter character, Ovid says that Jupiter allows himself to be "glorified" (*celebrari, Tr.* 4.4.18) by every tongue, saying that he adds his divinity to the poet's art (*Tr.* 4.4.17). In a metaphor involving himself, Ovid writes that a "raw wound" (*vulnera cruda*) "shrinks from" (*horrent, Pont.* 1.3.16) the touch of a hand about his psychological wounds and later goes on to write that blood which is expelled by a weak "lung" (*pulmone, Pont.* 1.3.19-20) is indicative of death nearing. In another metaphorical reference to himself fearing new misfortune, Ovid writes that a once-wounded "limb shrinks from" (*membra reformidant, Pont.* 2.7.13) a gentle touch. Ovid writes that his mind was slow to delight just as "eyes shun" (*reformidant… lumina, Pont.* 3.4.49-50) unaccustomed light and goes on to write that correction is such a laborious task that it "hurts" (*laedit, Pont.* 3.9.25) his mind with the icy chill of worry. These metaphorical agency-based depersonalisations are interesting because, while they are metaphors which contain depersonalisations, the metaphor is not created through depersonalisation and, as such, does not achieve the rank of metaphorical interpersonal depersonalisation. Furthermore, these depersonalisations seem purely poetic in nature as they hold no immediately obvious deeper meaning for Ovid. They appear to be simply plastic scene-setting.

Apart from his intentional use of the trope, the psychological function of removing the agency from oneself varies. It could provide a means of distancing oneself from one's emotions to diminish their severity while providing a means to cope with them by projecting them onto things other than oneself and viewing them from an external perspective. Distancing oneself from one's actions in the same way can help one to escape from what one has done, diminishing the gravity of the action and providing a means of projecting one's guilt to help cope with it. It is also important to note that while Ovid is depersonalising himself as an entity in this form of depersonalisation, he is simultaneously repersonifying aspects of himself that are non-human, stand-alone entities. This could provide comfort to the poet as he is surrounded by entities who can provide him with company and physical comfort. Regardless, this kind of depersonalisation is so frequent that it bears less consequence than the other two types, as it seems to be an established tool in Ovid's toolbox and is heavily supplemented by the others in the later works.

4.3   Objects and animals (Metaphorical depersonalisations)

When using intermediate depersonalisation, Ovid's depersonalisation of himself into objects and animals and his loved ones into objects or concepts which support these Ovid-stand-ins is

seen. This leads to some simultaneous repersonification, but it is not always as overt as with simple depersonalisation, although an argument can be made that the objects and animals are being personified because they are being equated to a human. However, they do not increase the net number of entities in Ovid's environment and, as such, cannot be seen as fulfilling his psychological need to have entities around him with which to interact. Instead, they fulfil a different need. In Ovid's intermediate self-depersonalisation form, Ovid depersonalises himself into objects and animals for the purpose of metaphor to explain his emotions or situation. This is a very simple way for Ovid to communicate rather difficult emotions regarding himself in terms which do not require him to speak about himself actively. This type of depersonalisation involves a strong use of metaphor and some metonymy for the technique to work. This is because it involves Ovid equating himself to a non-human through, or for the purpose of, metaphor in which he projects his emotions and behaviours onto the target to help convey them more clearly to the reader. Simultaneously, this helps him make his suffering seem to mean more as he changes the context to a more common scenario, which is better understood and which he has prior knowledge about. In this way, he can make sense of his feelings about what has happened to and because of him. Examples of this are Ovid comparing himself to objects and animals that are often worked to death or destruction with little to no praise or reward.

Claassen notes many different forms of Ovid's identification with non-humans in the exilic texts. She briefly mentions Ovid's minor identification with the personified ship in *Tristia* 1.4.10 and his later sympathy towards it (*Tr.* 1.10.20) but makes no further remarks about Ovid's identification with ships.[261] However, from my perspective of Ovid's depersonalisation, the most common individual metaphorical depersonalisation that Ovid uses involves ships, often ones which have been wrecked or gravely damaged. Ovid sometimes refers to himself as the ship. Ovid referring to himself as the ship appears to be the most common use of this metaphor, as it is seen fourteen times. Sometimes, it is through simple comparison where Ovid will compare himself to a ship, as seen in *Epistulae ex Ponto* 4.4.8, where Ovid writes that he was driven like a shipwreck (*naufragus*) to Getic waters. Ovid also sometimes uses this metaphor to refer to himself turning back to poetry. This is seen in *Tristia* 2.18, where, while referencing himself turning back to the craft which earned him his exile, Ovid compares himself to a beached ship which returns to the surging sea. Another example is in *Tristia* 5.7.35-

---

[261] Claassen (1990:107).

6, where Ovid compares himself turning back to poetry to a Greek ship battered by the waves of Euboea daring to run the waters of Cape Caphereus.[262] In both of these cases, the object or phenomenon that the poetry is being compared to is something that can still harm the ship gravely if the crew is not careful, emphasising Ovid's distrust of poetry.

Another common form of this simple ship metaphor involves depersonalising his friends into objects or phenomena which support the ship or otherwise including them in his ship metaphor. An example is in *Tristia* 1.5.17-8, where Ovid writes that if this ship, referring to himself, had been borne on a favourable breeze, then perhaps Carus's faithfulness would go unacknowledged. Ovid later asks Carus to grant a "safe shore" (*litora tuta*) for his "wreckage" (*naufragio, Tr*. 1.5.36). In this way, Carus is depersonalised into an object which supports the Ovid-ship. This sub-trope is seen again in *Tristia* 4.5.5-6, where Ovid compares Cotta Maximus to a safe harbour (*portus*) and himself to a ship which has been blasted by lightning, writing that Cotta Maximus offered him a safe harbour in his time of need. Here again, the friend is equated to an object beneficial to a ship in need, referencing the Augustus-Jupiter character. This sub-trope of the beneficial friend-object is repeated in the next book of the *Tristia,* where Ovid asks an unnamed individual or possibly even a group of individuals if they, who were the mainstay of his fortunes and his refuge and harbour, have ceased to care for him (*Tr*. 5.6.1-4). The reader does not know to whom this letter is addressed, but it is highly probable that it was written to them as Ovid describes them as being the reason for his fortunes. Regardless of who they are, Ovid depersonalises them into a harbour just as he did with Cotta Maximus in the previous poem, including the individual or individuals in a pre-existing Ovid-as-wrecked ship depersonalisation.

Ovid's depersonalisation of loved ones into objects which support his wreckage is seen again in the *Epistulae ex Ponto*, where Ovid compares Flaccus to a shore without rocks and himself to a shattered boat as he offers Ovid the help that so many deny him (*Pont.* 1.10.39-40). In this poem, Ovid refers to himself as a shattered boat, again drawing an individual into a pre-existing wrecked ship metaphor. It is possible that Ovid's reasoning for only using this form of interpersonal depersonalisation in this way is that he hoped not to offend any possible source of aid by comparing them to animals and objects unless they are supportive or shown in a positive light against Ovid's terrible situation. This support-object trope is seen again in

---

[262] Caphereus is a rocky area on the northern coast of Euboea, a large Aegean island close to Greece (Kline 2003:361), where the Greek fleet of ships had trouble while returning from Troy (Kline 2003:338).

Epistulae ex Ponto 3.2.5-6, where Ovid compares himself to a shattered boat with a storm-tossed sail and Cotta to the boat's only anchor, writing that Cotta's wellbeing removes much of Ovid's torment (*Pont.* 3.2.3). These positive depersonalisations are quite common when Ovid refers to his friends and this could be seen as genuine gratitude, or a further attempt to garner enough sympathy to trigger a plea for clemency on Ovid's behalf.

The final example of metaphorical depersonalisation of others comes when Ovid depersonalises his wife herself into a ship, writing that she should consider the time she chooses to ask Livia for Ovid's clemency lest her boat sets sail on an adverse tide (*Pont.* 3.1.129). Unlike his friends, who are depersonalised into support items for Ovid's shipwreck, Ovid's wife is depersonalised into a boat in this poem. This could be because she is undertaking something dangerous and unsure, attempting to plead for Ovid's clemency, and Ovid worries that she, too, may become a shipwreck like himself.

Ovid does not always depersonalise his friends when including them in the ship metaphor. As seen in the first half of the first example, where Carus is not depersonalised, there are two more examples of this sub-trope. The first is seen in *Epistulae ex Ponto* 2.3.57-60, where Ovid speaks of a boat with broken sails, writing that Cotta Maximus is loyal for raising them, though they are not as he wished. Ovid also writes that the boat in the metaphor is so shattered that people think it will soon sink, but the wreckage is still supported on Cotta Maximus's shoulders. The second example is seen in *Epistulae ex Ponto* 2.7.83, where Ovid begs Atticus to hold to what he has started by defending him and asks him not to desert the ship at sea, referring to himself. In each of these instances, the friend is beneficial to the ship, but they are not depersonalised concerning the ship. There seems to be no particular reason beyond artistic whimsey for this lack of depersonalisation as Cotta Maximus is depersonalised in *Tristia* 4.5.5-6 but is not depersonalised in *Epistulae ex Ponto* 2.3.57-60.

Ovid does once make use of the ship metaphor about his wife without depersonalising her in *Tristia* 1.6.5-8, where he refers to himself as a "ruin" (*ruina, Tr*. 1.6.5) and later clarifies that he is referring to himself as a "shipwreck" (*naufragii, Tr*. 1.6.8). He then praises his wife for ensuring that he, as a ship, is not despoiled and stripped bare by those who seek his planks. This is about her looking after his fiscal estate in Rome (*Tr*. 1.6.14). It is possible that this lack of depersonalisation stems from a sense of gratitude Ovid feels towards his wife for protecting his assets in Rome.

Sometimes, the loved one is not mentioned explicitly, as seen in *Tristia* 5.2.42, where Ovid compares himself to a ship untethered by any anchor when thinking about those closest to him abandoning him (*Tr*. 5.2.39), asking where he can turn and seek solace for his weariness (*Tr*. 5.2.41). The reason for this is apparent: Ovid is referring to all his loved ones instead of specific individuals in this case and cannot name them all.

Another relatively common sub-section of the Ovid-as-shipwreck metaphor is when he refers to his punishment as the thing that damaged the ship. This is seen in *Tristia* 2.99-100, where, after writing that being exiled has destroyed him, Ovid states that one storm blast drowns a ship which had safely weathered the ocean depths many times. In this case, he could be referring to himself as a ship that had safely weathered the depths, signifying that he had written many poems over the years, and the storm blast would be a reference to Augustus exiling him for one work. This seems to be confirmed in *Tristia* 2.469-70 where, after naming various famous poets and authors who could have received exile for their poetry and literature (*Tr*. 2.359-466), Ovid writes that he did not fear that he would be wrecked where so many others had sailed without incident. He then speaks about all kinds of non-famous writings that could have gotten others exiled (*Tr*. 2.471-92). While he does not directly refer to himself as a shipwreck in this instance, he implies that he is one through the use of the adjective "wrecked" in reference to a ship (*naufraga*) and the verb *ire*, meaning to go by land or sea which can be translated into English as "sailed".[263] In this case, Ovid refers to his Augustus-Jupiter character by writing that he was blasted by lightning, with the lightning being Augustus's exiling of him. This sub-trope is seen again twice. The first time is in *Tristia* 4.6.35-6, where Ovid compares himself to an old boat shattered in a small storm as opposed to a fresh ship, which does well in a furious storm. In this comparison, Ovid could be referring to his declining mental and physical state (*Tr*. 4.6.41-3) and how this makes enduring exile more difficult than it would have been were he younger and healthier. Secondly, in *Tristia* 5.11.13-14, Ovid compares himself to a ship which has been wrecked but not sunk and, though deprived of a harbour, still floats, in reference to the charge against him and Augustus's decision not to exile him fully or execute him (*Tr*. 5.11.15). In each of these cases, the lightning bolt, storm, and unnamed event causing the wreck could be read as Ovid's exile by looking at the context surrounding them.

Ovid also sometimes refers to his fate or future as the ship instead of himself, although these two seem to be intertwined in Ovid's mind. Obvious references to his future or fate as the ship

---

[263] *OLD* 2, s.v. "*eo*" 1c (Glare 2012).

are seen in the *Epistulae ex Ponto* four times. In *Epistulae ex Ponto* 2.2.30, Ovid writes that his ship does not sail through calm waters about him weathering exile as a rationalisation of why he would turn back to poetry, even though it was the cause of his downfall. In *Epistulae ex Ponto* 2.6.9-12, Ovid writes that he needed Graecinus's warning when he could have rounded Ceraunia[264] with all sails standing so that he might have avoided the cruel reefs and asks that now that he is shipwrecked, what use is it to learn what course his boat should have taken. In this metaphor, Ovid is referring to his fate as a ship.[265] In *Epistulae ex Ponto* 4.3.5-6, Ovid accuses Macer of being the first who wished to sail with him as long as his ship rested on a solid keel, but now that his help is needed, Macer slides away (*Pont.* 4.3.7-8). In this case, Ovid also seems to refer to his fate as the ship. In *Epistulae ex Ponto* 4.9.74, while asking Graecinus for help with his pleas for clemency, Ovid writes that if a breeze would fill a sail, that he would loosen the cables so that his ship could leave the waters of Styx.

However, whether Ovid is referring directly to himself as the ship or his fate is often unclear. This can be seen in *Tristia* 1.1.85 during a passage in which he writes about his fear of Augustus through a drawn-out Augustus-Jupiter metaphor (*Tr.* 1.1.74, 81-2). Ovid writes that his vessel, shattered by a mighty storm, dreads to go near the place where it was wrecked. Augustus or his decision to exile Ovid can be read as the storm, Ovid himself or his fate is the ship, and writing poetry is the place where the ship was wrecked. Later, in reference to garnering fame and being read by Augustus, Ovid tells the book to be content with being read by the middle orders (*Tr.* 1.1.88). At *Tristia* 3.5.4, Ovid refers to his fate or himself as a ship, writing that if it had been running before the wind, Carus could not have embraced him more closely. In *Tristia* 5.9.17, Ovid refers to his situation and possibly himself as a shipwreck, writing that most men had horror about his downfall (*Tr.* 5.9.15) and gazed at his shipwreck from a high hill (*Tr.* 5.9.17). In *Epistulae ex Ponto* 1.2.59-60, when thinking about his possible future change of location due to the mercy of Augustus, he writes that he believes a kinder shore might be granted to his shipwreck. In this case, he could be referring to the shipwreck as his exile and himself. In *Epistulae ex Ponto* 2.9.9-10, Ovid asks Cotys to welcome his shipwreck on a gentle shore and not to let the waves prove safer than the land. This could be in reference to a plea for clemency on Ovid's behalf. In *Epistulae ex Ponto* 4.8.27-8, Ovid writes that no matter how slight the breeze (the breeze being aid from Germanicus in Ovid's pleas for clemency), so long as it aids

---

[264] Ceraunia is the headland on the Adriatic coast of Illyria and Epirus. It was known to be dangerous (Kline 2003:341).
[265] Later he refers to himself as a ship writing that it would be wrong to abandon a ship in distress (*Pont.* 2.6.22).

Ovid, his foundering barque will rise again from the waves. In this case, Ovid might be referring to himself as the ship or his exile as the ship.

There are exceptions to the rule. There are two unusual instances where Ovid uses the ship metaphor to an end that is not repeated. Ovid once refers to his works as being the ship (*Tr.* 2.548) and once references the concept of poetry being the thing that caused the shipwreck, as seen in *Epistulae ex Ponto* 4.14.21-2, where Ovid asks if he is being driven towards the old reef again, into the waters where his ship was wrecked, about turning back to poetry. These themes are not new to Ovid's exilic literature as he often writes his poems or poetry itself to be something other than what it is. This is seen very commonly in the Comforting Muse character, seen in Chapter 3, where the character is a personification of poetry as a concept and sometimes Ovid's own poems.

There are many possible reasons for Ovid's extensive use of the ship metaphor, ranging from being influenced by the highly popular epic tales of the time that involved ships and sailing to Ovid drawing psychological inspiration from the coastal town he was exiled in to Ovid's acute awareness of the perils of seafaring. It is also possible that the reason for his almost overuse of this metaphor is a mixture of all of these, as Ovid could have been reading passages containing ships from the *Odyssey*, *Iliad,* or *Aeneid* while being in a coastal town, while also fearing being a victim of shipwreck at sea, all at once. Ovid was also known to compare himself extensively to characters and situations from the epic genre as a way to communicate the severity of his situation and how grave it felt to him. Examples of Ovid comparing himself and his situation to mythic or literary figures are abundant and stretch over large portions of the poems they appear in, such as in *Tristia* 3.4, where lines 19-30 contain this kind of metaphor. In the *Epistulae*, Ovid claims his suffering is far worse than Jason's, yet Jason received so much praise for his efforts (*Pont.* 1.4.23-44). It is quite possible that Ovid was trying to make his situation seem at the same level as an epic tale by using the shipwreck motif so often, indirectly asking for the praise and sympathy granted to the heroes of epic tales.[266]

---

[266] In accordance with Francis's tenet of the hero's journey providing a platform for literary depersonalisation (Francis 2023:141-62), it can be argued that Ovid's exilic literature can be read as a kind of half-finished hero's journey. However, this comparison is dubious as he is writing about events that have actually happened, so any similarities could be coincidence. Nevertheless, as seen here, there are moments where Ovid compares himself to the heroes of epic, signifying a possible attempt at replication of their stories through events that he stresses, such as the storms at sea on his journey to Tomis, and his one-sided "battle" against the god Augustus-Jupiter.

Besides ships, Ovid depersonalises himself into various other non-humans, including animals and objects. Common metaphorical depersonalisations which Ovid depersonalises himself into are animals, such as horses, oxen and dogs, as well as objects, such as a ship, farmland, or a building. Ovid makes passing references to animals and objects. Regarding passing references to animals, [267] he compares himself to a horse, writing that he does not shy at the bit as an unbroken horse does and instead endures his bitter troubles patiently (*Tr*. 5.4.15-6). Ovid also writes that a spirit with a miserable wound (such as his) should be spared as even oxen draw back their sore necks from the load (*Pont.* 1.5.23-4). Concerning objects,[268] Ovid refers to himself as a chariot that has been gravely wrecked (*Tr*. 4.8.36) and something with wheels and an axle (*Pont.* 4.9.10). He also once refers to himself as a useless plant (*Pont.* 2.1.15). Ovid also passingly equates himself to his semblance on the ring his friend Brutus wears (*Tr*. 1.7.6) and equates himself to an object of Sextus's estate, writing that Sextus cannot say he owns nothing in Pontus (*Pont.* 4.15.14-20). In a more complex metaphor, Ovid compares himself to a shattered house that falls to ruin under its mass (*Tr*. 2.83-6). This "ruined building" trope is echoed in *Tristia* 3.11.22-5, where Ovid compares himself to a downed citadel without standing walls. Furthermore, again, when he refers to himself as a stricken house (*Tr*. 5.4.34), although this could also be in reference to his familial house referring to his family and their name and status, which will have suffered after his exile.

Ovid sometimes groups these depersonalisations to illustrate further the point he is trying to convey. As such, these groupings are often used to illustrate complex ideas, such as his fear of Augustus, which he compares to a dove which has been wounded by a hawk's talon and now feels terror at the slightest sound of wings (*Tr*. 1.1.75-6) and a lamb which does not stray from the fold after being torn from the jaws of a hungry wolf (77-78). In this way, Ovid equates himself to prey animals and Augustus to predator animals, showing the power imbalance that Ovid feels so acutely. Another instance of an expression of vulnerability seen through these groupings is through the expression of the concept of people seeking to plunder his wealth in Rome, which he compares to an animal in a fold being caught unguarded by a hungry wolf and an unburied corpse being searched for by a greedy vulture (*Tr*. 1.6.9-12). In this comparison, Ovid's estate is depicted as unprotected and vulnerable, similar to how he views himself as

---

[267] In *Tr*. 4.9.27 Ovid likens himself to a bull or some horned animal as he writes that he is charging without raising his horns.

[268] In *Tr*. 5.2.40 Ovid refers to his situation as a shattered yoke.

prey in the previous example. He could be doing these groupings when he feels that a single comparison does not fully convey what he is trying to express.

With regard to his view of exile, Ovid seems to view himself as a beast of burden or as an object which is required to be tough and be able to withstand a great deal, but these animals and objects are typically not always granted the luxury of rest and comfort, and Ovid emphasises what happens to them when they are mistreated by being forced to work beyond their limits. When speaking about not gaining the patience to endure his exile although a significant amount of time has passed (*Tr.* 4.6.21-2), he compares his situation to old bullocks resisting the yoke (*Tr.* 4.6.23) and a horse which has been broken in that often fights its bit (*Tr.* 4.6.24). In this comparison, these animals should endure their harsh treatment as they have been trained to over time, just as Ovid should also have become accustomed to exile. However, just like the animals in his comparison being unable to endure their discomfort in silence, Ovid cannot yet endure his exile without complaint.

In another example, Ovid wistfully speaks about living out the end of his life peacefully in Rome (*Tr.* 4.8.27) without troubles and fears (*Tr.* 4.8.6). In this scenario, he compares his situation to shattered boats which are drawn up in dry dock before they fall apart in the water (*Tr.* 4.8.17-8); and a horse which grazes idly in a meadow before it disgraces its previous victories (*Tr.* 4.8.19-21). In this case, the things he is comparing himself to have been granted the simple life that makes the end of their hard work worth the trouble they have experienced. In contrast, Ovid, who should be enjoying his quiet years, is forced into a very uncomfortable situation where he must defend Tomis from barbarian raids and endure the frigid temperatures, as seen in Chapter 2. He cannot live out his remaining years in peace with his loved ones, highlighting the loneliness he feels and leading him to be homesick for Rome.

Later in his exilic poems, Ovid compares missing Rome to bulls seeking the pastures they know (*Pont.* 1.3.41) and lions who seek their lairs despite their wild natures (41-2). In this comparison, typically strong animals are shown to be vulnerable in wanting familiarity and comfort, just as Ovid, who seeks the familiarity and comfort of Rome but has to be strong enough to endure exile. Ovid speaks about his endless troubles in exile (*Pont.* 1.4.19), which are strong enough to break even the strongest of individuals. He compares that to a strong ox being broken in the body by the stubborn earth (11-2), soil that decays by never being allowed time to rest between harvests (13-4), a horse which is entered into every race in the Circus without a break in competition eventually failing (15-6), and a ship which is never allowed to dry dock, foundering in the waves (18-9). It would seem that in this comparison, Ovid's endless

troubles are beginning to cause a kind of psychological burnout as he has no time to rest between events that place stress on him, making further stressors all the more difficult to deal with and making his yearning for Rome that much stronger.

There is also a more expressive, psychological use for this trope in which Ovid consciously attempts to communicate his declining mental state. These are seen exclusively in the *Epistulae ex Ponto*. Instances of this are apparent where, for example, Ovid writes that his mind is decaying and compares the process to snow melting. He then speaks about molluscs gnawing away at a ship, waves carving cliffs, rust eating iron, and worms eating books. After these eating references, he writes that, like the above, his heart is being eaten by care, which will never end (*Pont.* 1.1.67-74). He also compares his heart to a candle, stating that it melts with unending sorrow like wax does when near a flame (*Pont.* 1.2.55-6). He later writes that his heart has been worn thinner than a ploughshare which is used, and the Appian way being hollowed by a wheel (*Pont.* 2.7.43-5). All the abovementioned types of imagery require the passage of time to wreak truly devastating results. The use of these different images while his existence in exile continues could signify that he is feeling hollow and worn thin by the endless sorrows he has endured in exile and is beginning to lose hope.

With regard to his poetry, Ovid also makes use of these groupings, albeit in different ways. Firstly, Ovid uses the grouping in a meta way to speak about writing an aspect of poetry within a poem. He complains about not being able to name the recipient of a poem by personifying the act of him writing the poem into his Muse. It is his Muse who is now chained and longing to say the name of the recipient of the poem. This personified Muse is compared to an eager hunting hound being checked by a leash (*Tr.* 5.9.27-8) and an eager racehorse who thuds at the unopened starting gate with its hooves and even its brow (29-32). These are both high-energy, powerful animals which are expected to perform, and the comparison of them wanting to do what they are supposed to do but being stopped by an immovable barrier speaks to Ovid's supposed burning desire to name his friend and his friend's firm boundary against their name being set in the poem.

Another major example of this grouping comes when Ovid begins to lose inspiration, skill and imagination. He compares the process to farmland that has not been refreshed by constant ploughing, producing nothing but weeds and brambles (*Tr.* 5.12.23-4); a horse that has been stabled for too long racing badly and being the last horse released from the starting gate (25-6); and a boat which is weakened by rot when it is kept out of the water for too long (27-8). In this way, Ovid is complaining that he is not writing enough, which is paradoxical as it is known

that he wrote prolifically while in exile. It is possible that Ovid had psychological reasons for not writing as much as he usually would, from a form of depression and a subsequent loss of interest in activities that once brought him joy.[269]

The third and final example comes when Ovid speaks of turning back to poetry, though it harmed him. This he compares to a bird seeking human protection from a hawk (*Pont.* 2.2.35-6) and to a doe seeking protection from a house when fleeing from hounds (37-8). What is interesting to note in these comparisons is that there is an animal seeking help from a human, which is just as likely to hurt it as the pursuing predator animal. In this way, Ovid is personifying poetry as he is comparing it to humans in these cases but also likening himself to prey animals that are typically not as smart and cunning as humans. This could speak to a distrust of the "intentions" of poetry, a distrust that it will hurt him again. Additionally, Francis's theory of strong imagery and metaphor being piquant ways to convey and create estrangement is relevant here as Ovid might have been trying to estrange himself from the emotions he is trying to convey by turning himself into a ship or identifying with prey animals.[270]

4.4   Complex depersonalisations

The final type of depersonalisation to be explored is complex depersonalisation, namely Ovid's depersonalisation of himself into non-humans without any simultaneous repersonification (intra-personal depersonalisation), along with his depersonalisation of the emperor Augustus into the Augustus-Jupiter character, and his depersonalisation of the locals on Pontus and simultaneous personification of the natural landscape of Pontus to create the Pontus character (inter-personal depersonalisation). This discussion necessitates a different style of analysis as each way Ovid uses complex depersonalisation is new and different from the next, meaning that these depersonalisations cannot be discussed in tandem as has been done in the preceding sections. Moreover, Ovid's complex interpersonal depersonalisations, the Augustus-Jupiter and Pontus characters, are entirely different in form from his other depersonalisations and from each other, typically relying heavily on metonymy and metaphor, respectively. So, each type of Complex depersonalisation will have its own sub-section in which it is fully explored and examined.

---

[269] American Psychiatric Association (2013:160-1).
[270] Francis (2023; 116-44).

4.4.1   True Ovidian self-depersonalisation

Ovid regularly depersonalises himself into non-humans, which are not personified, such as a dead body, or concepts, such as a name. These kinds of depersonalisations are regularly seen in the *Epistulae.* An example of Ovid depersonalising himself into a non-human, which is not then repersonified, is seen in the first poem of the final book of the *Epistulae*. Ovid reduces himself to a work of art, which he begs Sextus Pompeius to take care of.[271] He also depersonalises himself into a "humble possession" in *Epistulae ex Ponto* 4.15. Here, Claassen notes a change from being depersonalised into an inanimate object in this poem into a dead body in the final poem of the *Epistulae,* where Ovid wavers between identifying with several inanimate concepts ranging from being dead (*Pont*. 4.16.48) or being a dead body (*Pont*. 4.16.51) to being his own immortal Muse (*Pont*. 4.16.45-6).[272] Claassen also notes that Ovid frequently plays with the idea of already being dead.[273] However, Claassen seems to state that Ovid rises above this, claiming that he, through the proclamation of his own immortality, has overcome the "imperial authority that sought to still his poetic voice".[274] Here, the metaphorical death of Ovid has secured him everlasting life.[275] This discussion will focus on Ovid's depersonalisations towards the end of the exilic texts as they are different in nature from those found in the rest of his exilic literature in that the "net number" of entities is decreased as there is no simultaneous repersonification taking place along with the depersonalisation.

In its more complex form, Ovid depersonalises himself by not only removing his agency or sense of self, but also the concept of himself as a living being. This more complex form of depersonalisation is of specific importance because it provides a clearer window into Ovid's mental state. He is not simply describing how he feels through equating himself to an overworked beast of burden or distancing himself from his emotions and actions by ascribing agency to body parts, but rather showing a loss of sense of self or willingness to be himself. This links more strongly with the psychological definition of depersonalisation, a loss of identity and sense of self, and less with the literal definition, to remove a person's humanity, as seen in the other two categories. Ovid's expression of his mortality oscillates between wanting to die (*Tr*. 1.5, 1.2; *Pont.* 3.7 4.10); but not wanting to kill himself. This can be taken

---

[271] Claassen (1990:115).
[272] Claassen (1990:116).
[273] Claassen (1990:107).
[274] Claassen (1990:116).
[275] Claassen (1990:116).

to mean that Ovid wants to have already been dead without experiencing death itself, as this would have removed the need to die and would have given him the end result without the undesirable process of getting there. This morbid fascination with death can be seen as a symptom of depression called suicidal ideation, wherein an individual has thoughts of engaging in behaviours intended to end their life,[276] or it could simply be that Ovid preferred the idea of death over extended torture in exile. The difference between these two ideas is that one involves the active thoughts of wanting to kill oneself while the other involves a kind of passive suicidal ideation where the thought of not being alive is considered preferable to one's current existence, but there is no plan or goal in mind to die.

There are three general aspects of suicide that precede the act: ideation, intent or wish, and a plan. Ovid does not have a plan, but he exhibits ideation and intent, indicating signs of passive suicidal ideation. Passive suicidal ideation involves a desire to die but no actual steps being taken to complete the act.[277] Ovid claims in *Epistulae ex Ponto* 1.6.39-43 that his Muse stopped him from killing himself or writes that he finds he cannot die in *Tristia* 3.2.23-2. Ovid also shows a general fear of dying in Tomis as he fears his soul will wander the barren landscape for all of eternity (*Tr*. 3.3.61), and he dearly wishes to die in Rome or, at the very least, be buried in Rome (*Tr*. 3.3, *Pont.* 1.2.107-12, 4.16). Considering his fear of dying in Tomis but his yearning to have already been dead, it can be supposed that Ovid experienced passive suicidal ideation while also believing that suicide while in exile was an unacceptable option for him as he would be dying so far from Rome.

One possible reason for Ovid's keen interest in death and dying while in exile is his association of exile with a living death. According to Grebe, Ovid's dichotomy of wanting yet fearing death is expressed through his view of exile as a living death.[278] Grebe covers three perspectives which might explain why Ovid associated his exile with a living death. The first focuses on the unknowability of Pontus and how it is similar to the unknowability of death, with Pontus being outside of Ovid's known world and like the netherworld to him.[279] The second perspective covers the religious background of exile at the time, with Grebe noting Hasenfratz's theory that living in the ancient world was intimately linked to community and living with family and friends and that to be separated from these people would be the same as death.[280] In this

---

[276] Nock et al. (2008:134).
[277] Liu et al. (2020:367).
[278] Grebe (2010:494).
[279] Grebe (2010:492-500).
[280] Hasenfratz (1982:11 13); Grebe (2010:501).

section,[281] Grebe notes Williams's statement that Ovid depicts Tomis as though it is the underworld,[282] close to Styx (*Tr.* 5.9.19. *Pont.* 1.8.27; 2.3.44; 3.5.56; 4.9.74), cold (*Tr.* 3.4.47-8, 10.25; 5.13.6. *Pont.* 1.2.26, 3.37, 7.11; 2.7.72; 3.1.14; 4.12.33), barren (*Tr.* 3.4.51; 5.2.66. *Pont.* 3.1.19-20; 4.4.3) and bleak. These are noted as all being typical features of Hades.[283] Grebe closes this section by stating that due to Ovid's keen knowledge of Roman religion, shown in his *Fasti*, it is possible that he was influenced into viewing his exile as a living death by a religious background. The third perspective Grebe lays out is a legal one,[284] supported by Claassen,[285] indicating how the Roman legal system viewed exile in relation to death. According to Cicero, exile was not a punishment but a refuge from punishment such as imprisonment, death or dishonour (Cic. *Caecin*. 34.100). This statement is supported by Sallust, who writes that this was codified into law (Sall. *Cat*. 51.22). Grebe supposes that this means that the state viewed exile as equal to capital punishment.[286] I take issue with Grebe's assertion that Ovid would have been influenced by a religious background stemming from his writing of the *Fasti* as he always seems relatively irreverent towards the gods as he treats them as petty, flawed beings in the *Metamorphoses* and *Tristia* 2.289-300. Ovid was also a member of the more agnostic upper class. I believe that it is the unknowability of Pontus and the legal background regarding exile which could have influenced Ovid, in part, towards his hyper-focus on death and dying in his exilic texts as he frequently equates the moment of his exile to the moment of his death (*Tr.* 1.1.117-8, 7.38; 3.14.20-22; 5.1.47. *Pont.* 1.9.17). I believe he chose to depict Pontus as though it were Hades as a conscious use of poetic device meant to trigger imagery relating to death in his readers' minds.

Throughout his exilic texts, Ovid displays a significant amount of thought towards death and dying, often referring to himself as already dead in various ways. He regularly refers to the events of the night he left Rome as his funeral rites (*Tr.* 1.1.117-8, 7.38; 3.14.20-22. *Pont.* 1.9.17). He also writes that the *Metamorphoses* was saved or snatched from his funeral rites (*Tr.* 1.1.117-8, 7.38; 3.14.20-22). In reference to the quality of his works, he writes that his exilic texts are befitting of his funeral rites (*Tr.* 5.1.47).

---

[281] Grebe (2010:500-503).
[282] Williams (1994:13).
[283] Williams (1994:13).
[284] Grebe (2010:503-508).
[285] Claassen (1999:20, 239).
[286] Grebe (2010:505).

Most commonly, Ovid does not fear death (*Tr*. 1.2.51). He often wishes for death to come for him (*Tr*. 1.5.5-6; 5.7.23. *Pont*. 1.2.57), either by his own hand (*Pont*. 1.6.42), or by another's (*Tr*. 3.7.49). He sometimes laments that he has not died yet (*Pont*. 3.2.23-6) or writes that he would rather not be alive (*Tr*. 3.7.7) instead of showing an outright wish to die. He even complains that Augustus chose to exile him instead of executing him (*Tr*. 3.8.39-40) and laments the fact that his exile was not prevented by his death (*Tr*. 5.4.32). Ovid confesses to having tried to kill himself with a sword (*Pont*. 1.6.42) and that a friend restrained him from ending his life the night before he left Rome (*Pont.* 1.9.22). Ovid also admits to dreaming that he has died and been received into the heavenly realm, existing happily among the gods (*Pont*. 3.5.53-4).

While he may not consistently fear death, Ovid shows a strong aversion to dying in Pontus or away from Rome. This idea is first seen in *Tristia* 1.2.51-6, where Ovid speaks about the cruelness of death at sea, writing that death by natural causes or a blade is a blessing as one has the hope of a tomb, lying on solid ground as one dies, with the possibility of not being alone. However, Ovid is not comfortable dying in Pontus for similar reasons. He states that there will be no one to weep for his death, and there will be no death-bed instructions or laments, no friendly hands to close his eyes and no funerary rites or a tomb (*Tr*. 3.3.40-5). Ovid seems to be fearful of having his soul wander Pontus after he has died (*Pont*. 1.2.111-2), and as such,[287] Ovid wishes that the soul vanishes at death so that he would not need to wander among the savage Sarmatian dead in death (*Tr*. 3.3.59-64). He begs his wife to ensure that his bones are brought back to Rome in an urn so that he may no longer be an exile in death (*Tr*. 3.3.65-6). Ovid has an aversion to the idea of the soil of Pontus covering his bones (*Pont*. 1.2.57-8, 107-8; 3.1.5-6) but eventually seems to become a bit more accustomed to the idea (*Pont*. 1.6.49; 3.7.19, 40) but he still wishes to be buried somewhere other than Pontus (*Pont*. 1.2.150; 3.9.27-9, 38).

Ovid oscillates between fearing death and wishing for it, although the instances of him fearing death are far fewer than his desire for it. He shows his fear of death by begging the gods of the sea and sky to spare him from a cruel death (*Tr*. 1.4.27-8) and later begs for the doors of death to be closed to him (*Pont.* 3.2.29-30). He writes that he fears the shadow of death with an anxious mind (*Tr*. 1.11.23-24) and explains that he is anxious for his life (*Tr*. 3.3.25). But it is

---

[287] Compare this to *Tr*. 5.7.23 where Ovid writes he wishes he had died among the barbarians so that his soul could leave the hateful place of Pontus. This shows a discrepancy in Ovid's beliefs of the soul and what happens to it when an individual dies.

possible that he fears dying away from Rome more than he fears dying in general and is only so fearful of dying because the abovementioned conditions are unfavourable for death.

While he does sometimes play with the idea of being dead in his *Tristia*, such as calling his works orphaned in *Tristia* 3.7, and where he has small sections referring to himself as if he were already dead, such as in *Tristia* 3.11.25-32,[288] Ovid seems to grow more and more interested in exploring the idea of being "not alive" or completely dead through the course of his exilic works. He no longer removes his agency or casts a non-human as himself to depersonalise himself. Instead, he accepts that he is human and wishes to not be one anymore by dying or being dead. This thought culminates in the final poem of his *Epistulae,* where Ovid becomes a "dead body". Through this poem, however, Ovid alternates from being dead to being morbidly non-human. No longer a horse or ship, he is only a name (*Pont.* 4.16.3), an immortal Muse (*Pont.* 4.16.45-6), nothing except sentient life (*Pont.* 4.16.49).[289] It is noteworthy that a name (*nomen*) in Latin can refer to many things ranging from a personal name,[290] a name as it is used to remember someone,[291] or the fame or renown of a person,[292] usually the "good name" of the said person.[293] It can also refer to the name of an individual indicating authorship[294] or someone's name used to disguise the true nature of said person.[295] Notably, it can also refer to the name of someone or something as opposed to their substance[296] or as grounds for an accusation or complaint.[297] The various meanings for the word *nomen* make this depersonalisation one of many facets. However, it must be noted that all of these concepts, a name, an immortal muse, and sentient life, do not have bodies, and Ovid possibly views these concepts as being unable to die, thus comforting himself over his inevitable death in Tomis by equating himself to something that cannot die, like a god or a name. This could also be seen as a form of Ovid's acceptance of his fate, a poignant end to his final poem. However, the tone of the poem is decidedly a sombre one.

---

[288] However, this rant is less of a statement and more of an accusation and attempt at manipulation against the recipient of the poem.
[289] Claassen (1990:116).
[290] *OLD* 2, s.v. "*nomen*" 1a (Glare 2012).
[291] *OLD* 2, s.v. "*nomen*" 9a (Glare 2012).
[292] *OLD* 2, s.v. "*nomen*" 11a & b (Glare 2012).
[293] *OLD* 2, s.v. "*nomen*" 12a (Glare 2012).
[294] *OLD* 2, s.v. "*nomen*" 13a (Glare 2012).
[295] *OLD* 2, s.v. "*nomen*" 15a (Glare 2012).
[296] *OLD* 2, s.v. "*nomen*" 16a & b (Glare 2012).
[297] *OLD* 2, s.v. "*nomen*" 25a (Glare 2012).

There is a defining difference between the first two kinds of Ovidian self-depersonalisation and his last one, both literarily and psychologically. When examining the literature, it could be argued that by depersonalising himself in both the simple and intermediate forms of Ovidian self-depersonalisation, Ovid is simultaneously personifying the object he is either ascribing his agency to, or the non-human he is equating himself to, as he is, by default, giving human characteristics to non-human entities. However, in the complex form, Ovid is purely depersonalising himself. He no longer writes that he is like a racehorse or that his arms are cradling him. He ends his own narrative by being dead or ceasing to exist. No simultaneous depersonalisation and repersonification are happening. Psychologically, this could mean that Ovid has regressed to a point in which he either subconsciously realises that creating more entities will not quell his loneliness, or he simply does not care about feeling isolated.

It is noteworthy that Ovid might view his intrapersonal depersonalisation as a kind of punishment. There seems to be a connection when looking at the more common transformation tropes in the *Metamorphoses*, where the mortals are often transformed due to some actual or perceived transgression against a god.[298] Ovid's depiction of Augustus as the Augustus-Jupiter character shows a belief that Augustus has, at the very least, the power of a god and Ovid could be viewing this depersonalisation as his punishment for transgressing a god (Augustus). It is also possible to view Ovid's expression of wishing to be dead instead of committing suicide as a form of psychological sublimation,[299] where his suicidal ideation is viewed as unacceptable by him. So, he writes about the concept of being dead in his poetry as a way to physically express his wish to actually be dead in an acceptable and constructive way to satisfy the suicidal ideation he might have felt.

When regarding Ovid's various forms of depersonalisation, his internal or intrapersonal depersonalisation is more akin to the psychological definition of depersonalisation—wherein an individual loses touch with their sense of self or reality—than his external depersonalisation of others, as it is more closely linked to his own psychological state and can be viewed as approaching an actual symptom of his declining mental state. Of course, Ovid consciously makes use of this trope of intrapersonal depersonalisation in the text, as he has in his pre-exilic

---

[298] See stories such as the Actaeon, and Arachne tales in the *Met.* for good examples of transformation as punishment for a perceived slight. While these individuals did not lose their lives in a literal sense, they did lose their lives as Romans, just as Ovid had.

[299] According to Behrendt (2012:122), sublimation is a defence mechanism whereby a socially unacceptable impulse or idealization or destructive behaviour (Laughlin 1970:297) is replaced by a socially acceptable behaviour which satisfies the impulse or idealization (Laughlin 1970:300) .

works such as the *Amores.* However, the complexity and the intent of the trope are indicative of his mental state as Ovid puts far more effort into his depersonalisations in his exilic texts, putting an enormous amount of emphasis on removing his own humanity in a way that is neither playful nor witty.

4.4.2 Augustus-Jupiter, and Pontus

Ovid's intrapersonal depersonalisation may have no simultaneous repersonification, but this is not the case with his interpersonal depersonalisations, which arguably both involve some level of personification, either through Ovid equating a human to a non-human as with the Augustus-Jupiter character or through a personification of the natural landscape, seen in the Pontus character. However different in construction, both characters seem to fulfil similar roles for Ovid. While in exile, Ovid needs to play the role of both the suppliant and the supplicant to Augustus. This necessity removes his ability to openly express negative beliefs and emotions, such as fear, anger and indignation, about the emperor in his poetry, as this would seriously jeopardise his chances of clemency. This creates an issue for Ovid because he needs to express these negative emotions to help cope with his situation. Due to this, Ovid creates oppressors through depersonalisation and repersonification, drawing inspiration from his surroundings and previous knowledge, specifically the Augustus-Jupiter and Pontus characters, who are powerful and harsh characters with little to no humanity in them, which Ovid can rebel against without fear of recourse. The resulting characters not only fulfil his need to surround himself with entities with which he can establish a social connection, but they also fulfil his need to express his negative emotions about his exile.

i. Augustus-Jupiter

One of Ovid's most common interpersonal depersonalisations in his exilic works is the depersonalisation of emperor Augustus. He does this in two main ways: by removing Augustus's agency by ascribing the decision of relegating him and the choice of recalling him to Augustus's emotions, namely his anger (a more simple form of interpersonal depersonalisation); and by using the god Jupiter as a complex metonym for Augustus (a more complex form of interpersonal depersonalisation involving elements of both depersonalisation and personification).[300] By using these techniques, Augustus's power is diminished as it is

---

[300] Ovid could also be trying to flatter Augustus by calling him a god and equating him so thoroughly to the most powerful of all the gods.

depicted as being exerted and controlled by his emotions and Augustus himself is equated to an all-powerful, if unjust and wrathful, god.

Claassen also makes a brief note of Ovid's depersonalisation of Augustus, although she sees this character in reference to the Bear constellation, which she links to Augustus through a known birthmark of his that resembled it (Suet. *Aug*. 73).[301] However, Claassen does not take this concept further in her 1990 article as she had already previously focused on it explicitly in her 1987 article "*Error* and the Imperial Household: An Angry God and the Exiled Ovid's Fate". In this article, Claassen discusses the relationship between Ovid and Augustus, as well as his family, as it is seen through Ovid's typically ironic and irreverent depictions of, and references to, them as gods, proposing several theories for Ovid speaking of Augustus in deific terms,[302] and why the rate of this changes over time.[303]

As her fourth reason, Claassen proposes that Ovid might have realised that he no longer had a chance of repeal and consoled himself through irreverent and guileless appeals to the deified Augustus as a form of self-consolation. This theory makes sense in that Ovid used this trope as an unconscious coping mechanism, although Claassen focuses more on Ovid's appeals for clemency and his tone towards Augustus and less on his psychological state. I, too, believe that

---

[301] Claassen (1990:106). The constellation is personified through the moniker Callisto, falling in line with Ovid's portrayal of her story in his *Metamorphoses*. Callisto was transformed into the Bear constellation by Jupiter in this passage. In this way, Callisto, previously an individual oppressed by Jupiter, becomes an integral part of Ovid's oppression by Augustus in Tomis, as the Bear constellation is constantly visible in the sky from Tomis, making it a part of Pontus's natural landscape.

[302] The first is that Ovid may have felt that his appeals to the imperial family were flattering enough at a surface level that he could risk being irreverent and playful, always having the opportunity to point to the surface-level adulation if accused of his irreverence. Her second theory is that the poems were never really intended for Augustus's readership. Her third theory is that Augustus typically did not heed lampoons and Ovid assumed that the negative aspects of his poems would be ignored. Her fourth theory is that Ovid realised he would never be recalled and comforted himself with thinly-veiled barbs, hidden in vain appeals. Her fifth theory, which she states is not generally accepted, is that Ovid was never exiled to begin with and that it was his books and not the poet himself who was exiled. Claassen goes on for the rest of the paper to expand upon the legitimacy of this fifth theory and proposes her own supposition that Ovid's exilic poems create the *myth of the exile*, a story of the Augustan victim who stands "alone in a mythical world where malevolent nature conspires with a relentless angry god to persecute him", who is aided and comforted by his Muse who is an all-powerful goddess and takes part in similar activities to the mythical heroes depicted in literature. In this theory, the deification of the emperor is necessary to create the all-powerful persecuting god who oppresses and punishes the hero.[302] The following analysis reveals several conscious and unconscious reasons for Ovid's use of depersonalisation on the emperor Augustus.

[303] Claassen breaks Ovid's reference to the imperial family, most notably Augustus, into phases and tracks Ovid's use of deification of the emperor through these phases. The percentages of poems in each phase which reference the divinity of the emperor are as follows: Phase one (*Tr*. 1 and 2): 75%; Phase two (*Tr*. 3 and 4): 75%; Phase three (*Tr*. 5): 93%; Phase four (*Pont.* 1, 2 and 3): 77%; and Phase five (*Pont.* 4): 69% (Claassen 1987:32, 34). Claassen takes a statistical approach and notes that the only poems that do not refer to the divinity of the emperor are *Tr*. 1.7, 8, 11; 3.3, 10; 4.4, 7; 5.13. *Pont.* 1.3; 2.6, 10, 11; 3.5, 8; 4.1, 2, 7, 10 and 16. It is important to note that Claassen takes the whole of *Tristia* 2 to assume the emperor's divinity (Claassen 1987:32).

Ovid created the Augustus-Jupiter character to console himself. However, I also believe that there are psychological underpinnings to Ovid's reasons for creating this character.

Augustus-Jupiter

Ovid's most common complex personification and depersonalisation is his depersonalisation of the emperor Augustus into the personified Augustus-Jupiter character. The Augustus-Jupiter character is a depersonalisation that retains the sentience of a human but is decidedly non-human, as the Roman gods were not considered human, even though, in later times, they were depicted anthropomorphically. Furthermore, the typical Roman view of divinity vastly differed from the anthropomorphic Greek gods, viewed as psychologically human with emotions. Roman gods were initially not anthropomorphic in nature and were merely represented by symbols of the elements they held dominion over.[304] However, this changed in later times with Roman equivalents of the Greek gods seen in the works of poets heavily influenced by Greek poetry, like Ovid, Vergil and Horace. These anthropomorphic Roman equivalents were invented by poets for literary purposes and later used with political motivations.[305] While the Greeks certainly used their gods for literary and political reasons, their anthropomorphic forms were not created by poets specifically for these purposes. It must be noted that even by the time emperors were posthumously raised to the status of a god, there was a distinction between the deified individuals and the now pre-existing anthropomorphized Roman gods, showing a disconnect between even deified humans and the original gods. This explains why, although they are personified, the gods were not considered human or fully "humanized". They were categorically different to humans, even to the ancients. It would appear that this distinction comes specifically from whether the individual was originally immortal or not (Serv. *Ad Aen*. 5.45). In this passage, Servius discusses whether to use *divi* or *dii* to refer to mortals made into gods and the actual gods, respectively, or whether to use the inverse as Varro and Ateius supposedly did. Servius seems opposed to Vergil's tendency to switch between using words such as *divus*[306] and *deus,*[307] which referred to the deified human individuals and the original gods respectively, indifferently and seems to believe that the two should be kept separate from one another as they are fundamentally different from each other in his eyes. The Romans drew

---

[304] Woodburn Hyde (1946:9).
[305] Powell (2015:633-6).
[306] *OLD* 2, s.v. "*diuus*" 1c (Glare 2012).
[307] *OLD* 2, s.v. "*deus*" 1a (Glare 2012).

a sharp distinction between the immortals and mortals, and this can be seen as the defining difference separating the anthropomorphic gods from their human subjects.

Additionally, upper-class Romans, such as Ovid, tended to have a somewhat pragmatic and rather agnostic view towards the gods, with numismatics showing that the elites would decide which gods were important enough to put on coins instead of, conversely, putting the most important gods on coins.[308] This notion of picking and choosing which gods to allow in the public eye and which to discard entirely, signifying a general agnostic view of the gods in general, is echoed in Cicero *De legibus* 2.28 where he decreed that gods such as Febris, "Fever", and Mala Fortuna, "Misfortune", were to have their altars and temples inside Rome repudiated as their existence could be considered unfavourable or unacceptable. This pruning of Roman religion seems to have been one of the main purposes of *De legibus*.[309] This suggests that to an upper-class individual such as Ovid, a god like Jupiter is less real or a less immediate threat than a human such as Augustus.

Ovid's view of the gods can perhaps be gleaned from his treatment of them in the *Metamorphoses*. This is seen countless times in Ovid's *Metamorphoses,* where the gods are shown to have the ability to alter a mortal's life, usually for the worse, for the rest of their days, for minor perceived slights against them.[310] An example of this is Arachne, who was transformed into a spider for winning a tapestry weaving competition after boldly declaring a challenge against the goddess Minerva, although she was in disguise.[311] In this tale, Minerva depicts the punishment of mortals who had challenged the gods in some way and had been "put in their place", so to say, a chilling warning against Arachne, who is none the wiser. In her tapestry, Arachne exposes the follies of the gods by depicting their various non-consensual,[312] extramarital affairs.[313] The goddess reacts not with objective and divine justice but is depicted by Ovid as an enraged woman who cannot stand to lose anything.[314] It has been argued that Arachne, like Echo from Book 3 of the *Metamorphoses,* is heavily punished for telling the

---

[308] Kaizer (2013:122).
[309] Momigliano (1984:206).
[310] These are typically female characters such as Io (Ov. *Met*. 1.568-746), Callisto (Ov. *Met*. 2.401-507), Cyane (Ov. *Met.* 5.425-86), Arethusa (Ov. *Met*. 5.572-641), Dryope (Ov. *Met*. 9.324-93), and Scylla (Ov. *Met*. 14.1-74) (Segal 1998:37).
[311] This tale has been extensively covered by modern scholars such as Fantham (2004:53-6) and Ziogas (2013:94-110). See Hejduk (2012) for an interesting perspective on Arachne's attitude displayed towards the disguised Minerva at the beginning of the competition.
[312] Fantham (2004:63).
[313] See Leach (1974) for a discussion on the different tapestries as they relate to Ovidian aesthetics.
[314] Segal (1971:385).

truth,[315] while others argue that her punishment was deserved.[316] Another example, albeit of a truly innocent case strikingly similar to Ovid's *error*, is the story of Actaeon. He was a man who unwittingly saw something he should not have seen: the goddess Diana bathing. He is turned into a stag and subsequently hunted and torn apart by his own hunting dogs as punishment for his "transgression" (Ov. *Met*. 3.138-252). Again, a god seems to behave in a highly exaggerated way to a perceived slight, with the punishment vastly overshadowing the acts of the human individual. It would appear that, to Ovid at least, the defining characteristics of the gods were their phenomenal power and ability to shape and alter the lives of the mortals around them, as well as highly exaggerated human emotions that went beyond what a person would feel. It is possible that the Augustus-Jupiter character was created as a way for Ovid to reconcile the fact that a man had altered his life in such a drastic way that only a god should be able to do.

This god-like character is created by using Jupiter as a metonym for Augustus and using deific terms to refer to him instead of speaking directly about the emperor. He does this in various ways. He sometimes forgoes referring explicitly to Augustus, such as when he says that he fears Jupiter's weapon (*Tr.* 1.1.81) and then he says that, by being exiled by Augustus, he has been struck by Jupiter's fiery bolts (*Tr.* 5.3.69-70). He also uses comparisons, as seen when he compares himself with Ulysses, Ovid claiming that "Neptune's anger (with Ulysses) was much slighter than Jupiter's (with Ovid)" (*Tr.* 3.11.62). This is an interesting case where both forms of depersonalisation are present simultaneously. Ovid refers to Augustus as Jupiter while also transferring the agency of his actions to his anger, as in this case, the anger of Jupiter is referring to Ovid's exile. Michalopolous (2017) focuses on the entirety of *Tristia* 1, which he likens to the story of Aeneas and later focuses specifically on *Tristia* 1.3, where he looks at Ovid recounting his wife saying that Caesar's anger drives Ovid to leave (*Tr.* 1.3.85). Michalopolous understands this as Augustus's anger persecuting Ovid. Michalopolous then contrasts this persecution of Ovid by Augustus's anger with Aeneas being persecuted by Juno's anger.[317] I believe this poem can be considered a form of Ovid deifying Augustus, similar to the Ulysses comparison by equating Augustus with a god, albeit not Jupiter specifically. However, this connection is not explicit within the text.

---

[315] Ahl (1985:199).
[316] Segal (1998:37), (1971:385).
[317] Michalopolous (2017:254-8).

The references can also be a mixture of the two, as seen in a letter about his recently delivered silver images of the imperial family, where Ovid says that he cherishes the forms created by art so that men can know the gods concealed by the heavens and worship Jupiter through his image (*Pont.* 2.8.62). In this way, Ovid depersonalises Augustus by removing his humanity and instead equating him to a god. While this is not necessarily an insult on the surface, the gods were not necessarily known for their compassion to humans whom they felt had slighted them and were often quick to deal out harsh punishments upon these humans. This is seen in multiple instances across Ovid's own *Metamorphoses,* with one of the most poignant examples being the tale of Callisto, a mortal woman who was turned into the Bear constellation by a jealous Juno for being raped by Jupiter. Examples like this and the above Actaeon and Arachne episodes are significant as they highlight this theme. In many cases, these punishments seem, to humans, to severely outweigh the perceived slight. In this way, both the validity and the severity of Augustus's actions can be downplayed and reframed as the outbursts of a slighted god.

Ovid's methods of depersonalising Augustus into Jupiter were relatively unusual. One way Ovid achieves part of the complex type of Augustan depersonalisation is by frequently using words such as *deus* and *numen* about Augustus or, by extension, the imperial family without direct reference to Jupiter. He uses these terms 172 and 64 times, respectively, according to Claassen (2008:126).[318] The word *deus* can be most simply translated as "god" or "deity". The word *numen*, however, is slightly more complex. In his discussion on river gods, Powell says that *numen* literally means "nodder" or an entity which nods and refers to the original Roman perception of gods as personifications of qualities with minimal functions.[319] These *numina* could only assent or refuse requests made of them through *sacrificium,* in which an offering is brought to the *numen* along with a request, believing that the *numen* would fulfil their side of the bargain. A *numen* could inhabit almost anything and serve almost any function. Other scholars who have taken a more in-depth look into the *numen* of an individual describe it as the individual's "[d]ivine force or power", which is deific in nature and could be worshipped.[320] The word *numen* is in the neuter, so Gradel argues that the *numen* of an emperor could not be personified and sacrificed to as there was no easy way to personify it and make sacrifices to it since gender was a determining factor in the sacrifices made to a deity.[321] As such, he argues

---

[318] Claassen (2008:125).
[319] Powel (2015:635).
[320] Gradel (2002:234).
[321] Gradel (2002:244).

that to worship an emperor's *numen* would be to worship the emperor himself, as the iconography used to depict an emperor's *numen* was the imagery of the emperor himself. An example of this is seen in Suetonius when he describes the temple of the emperor Caligula's *numen* as containing a golden statue of the emperor dressed each day in the same way the emperor was (Suet. *Cal*. 22.3).

The use of the word *numen* is typically seen in *Tristia* 5 and *Epistulae* 1, 2, and 3, but it is especially seen in *Epistulae* 2.8, where Ovid talks about worshipping silver portraits of the imperial family sent to him from Rome as his personal deities, and where he claims to see their faces soften and they begin to nod as his poem continues (*Pont.* 2.8.73-4).[322] The word *numen* was equated with *deus* when referring to the emperor's characteristics and the man himself. In this way, the exilic Ovidian Augustus was a god. Ovid's use of *deus* and *numen* in a deification context is noticed by Claassen to have declined over the exilic texts before increasing in the first three books of the *Epistulae* and declining again afterwards. Claassen has made a statistical approach to this. She has divided up Ovid's exilic work into five phases. She has shown that Augustus is referred to using deific terms in 8 of the 11 poems in *Tristia* 1, the entire of *Tristia* 2 if it is counted as one poem, 11 of the 14 poems of *Tristia* 3, 8 of the 10 poems in *Tristia* 4, 13 of the 14 poems in *Tristia* 5, 9 of the ten poems in *Epistulae ex Ponto* 1, 7 of the 11 poems in *Epistulae ex Ponto* 2, 7 of the 9 poems in *Epistulae ex Ponto* 3, and 11 of the 16 poems in *Epistulae ex Ponto* 4.[323] This decline could be due to Augustus's death. This trend is important because it speaks to Ovid's desperation for recall. His attempts to flatter Augustus in hopes of a change of location increase over time and then fall away as that avenue becomes no longer viable, and he subsequently loses hope after Augustus passes on.

The other, more common, method to depersonalise Augustus as a god was to deify Augustus as a living divinity who was also Jupiter, through the imperial cult. Gradel provides a succinct definition for emperor worship or the "imperial cult" by following the ancient term *divini* or *summi* or *caelestes honores,* which were the highest form of honours given to an individual, through which gods were cultivated from the emperor who could either be dead or alive.[324] Examples of Ovid participating in his version of the imperial cult are seen in *Epistulae ex Ponto* 4.6. Ovid refers to the now-dead Augustus as the new god, and in *Epistulae ex Ponto* 4.9.108,

---

[322] In *Pont.* 2.8, Ovid uses the word *numen* six times in lines 6, 10, 15, 35, 51 and 67.
[323] Claassen (1987:34, 44). For an in-depth look into Ovid's use of deific Latin terms in reference to Augustus see Claassen (2008:125-9).
[324] Gradel (2002:7).

Ovid says that Augustus is no less a power now that he has died and become a god. Later, in 115, Ovid says he celebrates the birthday of the god, Augustus, at his own personal altar. However, it must be noted that living deification was not the norm before Julius Caesar. The practice of posthumous deification became the official norm, deifying several emperors with the term *divus*[325] under the Julio-Claudians.[326] However, the *numen* and *genius* of a living emperor often received, at the very least, private or non-state level worship.[327] The *genius* was "[t]he natural god of each place or thing or person" (Serv. *G*. 1.302). According to Gradel,[328] the worship of the *genius* did not imply divinity as all living men and gods had a *genius,* and therefore, it did not credit the "owner" with divine status.

Julius Caesar was elevated to deific status a few months before his death. This is corroborated by Suetonius (Suet. *Caes*. 76.1; 84), Dio (Dio 44.4-6), Appian (App. *BC*. 2.106) and Cicero (Cic. *Phil.* 2.43.110). However, some contention to this issue is introduced by Plutarch as he seemed to date Caesar's deification after his death (Plut. *Caes*. 67-4). It should be noted that Gradel states this is the only source with this supposition.[329] A statue of Julius Caesar, with an inscription (*hēmítheos* lit. "half-god") giving him, at the very least, living demigod status, was erected in his lifetime.[330] Other Roman rulers before Julius Caesar were not publicly deified while still alive.[331] Because of this, Caesar began a tradition in Roman literature—in which Augustus took part—in tracing the Julian family's history back to Aeneas through his son Iulus. Proponents of this tradition in literature, apart from Ovid, are poets whom Augustus patronised, namely Virgil and Horace.[332]

According to Taylor, an early pioneer of the study of the imperial cult, Vergil provides the reader with the first account of a deified Augustus in his first eclogue after Augustus had saved Vergil's family farm from being confiscated and given to soldiers as promised allotments. In

---

[325] Gradel (2002:63). Gradel notes that deification under the term *divi* was so common by the time of Dio that a contemporary writer, Herodian, could explain the custom to his Greek audience (Hdn. 4.2.1) and that writers such as Servius speak about the practice of deifying dead emperors with the term *divi* as opposed to *dii* which is reserved for immortals (Serv. *Ad Aen*. 5.45).

[326] Gradel (2002:114).

[327] For the worship of the *numen* see Gradel (2002) Chapter 10 "*Numen Augustorum*"; Fishwick (1991) Chapter 2, "*Numina Augustorum*"; for worship of the *genius* see Gradel (2002) *passim* e.g., Chapter 7, "The Emperor's Genius in State Cult", Fishwick (1991) *passim* e.g., Chapter 1, "*Genius* and *Numen*" as well as Suetonius (*Aug*. 60). For a discussion on the similarity between the *numen* and *genius*, see Fishwick (1991:375-87).

[328] Gradel (2002:7).

[329] Gradel (2002:55).

[330] Gradel (2002:61).

[331] Gradel (2002:32).

[332] Scott (1930:43, 46). This source is accepted, albeit hesitantly due to its age, because it was referenced by two newer, seminal sources, namely Fishwick (1991) and Gradel (2002).

this poem, one of the shepherds who has had his farm restored to him declares that the one who saved the shepherd's farm will always be a god in his (the shepherd's) eyes and that he will often sacrifice young lambs on the altar of this god (Verg. *Ecl.* 1.7). This is a more minor or lesser form of deification as it is a shepherd who deifies Augustus and not an individual with any real authority.

Grebe states that there are numerous moments of subtext in the *Aeneid* where Augustus is linked to divinity with three explicit instances.[333] The first time is during Jupiter's prophecy of Rome's future fame in 1.257-96, where an individual of the line of Aeneas, thus being of divine lineage, is said to one day bring great glory to Rome and end the war. However, the passage states that the individual will be named Julius, after Aeneas's son, Iulus. Both Grebe and Galinksy believe that Vergil was being ambiguous here about whether he was referring to Julius Caesar or Augustus.[334] This is a reasonable argument as both individuals were a part of the Julian lineage, and the intentional vagueness can be seen as an implicit assertion of Augustus's divinity as, regardless of who is mentioned, his divine lineage is traced back to Aeneas through the handing down of the name Iulus. The second is when Vergil places Augustus and Caesar in between the Roman kings Romulus, the mythical founder of Rome, and Numa during his pageant of heroes in the sixth book, linking Augustus to the divine Romulus as a kind of "second" Romulus.[335] In lines 6.791-805, Augustus is explicitly labelled as the "son of a god" (Ver. *Aen.* 6.792) and is implied to be a second Saturnus,[336] as he will re-establish the Golden Age. Brooks argues that Augustus is labelled a *theios aner*, a divine man, who will achieve divinity through his actions.[337] The third instance of Augustus being linked to the gods comes from the description of Aeneas's shield, which was made by the god Vulcan and as such, its prophecy is true,[338] namely in the eighth book, which depicts the battle of Actium and Augustus's Triple triumph (Ver. *Aen.* 8.671-728).[339] This is more of a battle between the Roman gods and the Egyptian gods, as Augustus is supported by the Penates and the great gods (Ver. *Aen.* 8.679), while Mark Anthony and Cleopatra are supported by "every kind of monstrous gods" (Ver. *Aen.* 8.698).[340] In each of these passages, Augustus is never

---

[333] For implicit references, see Grebe (2004:56-9).
[334] Grebe (2004:49); Galinsky (1996:251).
[335] Cairns (1989:60-1).
[336] Saturnus was the ancient Roman god of sowing or of seed-corn (*OCD* 4, s.v. "Saturnus" [Hornblower et al.]).
[337] Brooks (1963:302).
[338] Grebe (2004:53).
[339] Grebe (2004:53).
[340] See Hardie (1986:336-76) for an analysis on the Gigantomachic aspects of this passage.

mentioned to be a god but is instead linked to a god and given implicit divinity by being a descendant of Aeneas, the "son of a god", and being supported by the gods. This is very different from Ovid's form of deification, where Augustus is openly labelled as a god or is strongly equated with Jupiter specifically.

Horace's treatment of Augustan deification is of a lesser degree, which is understandable as Horace had once been opposed to Augustus.[341] He supported Brutus after Caesar's death[342] and took part in the battle of Philippi against Augustus (Hor. *Carm.* 2.7). Instead of deifying Augustus outright, he claims that Augustus will one day achieve divinity, saying that when he had completed his conquests and added the Persians and the Britons to the Roman realm, then he will be revealed as a god, a Jupiter on earth (Hor. *Carm*. 3.5.1-4). Horace also takes part in the divine lineage motif, as seen in *Odes* 4.5, where Horace refers to Augustus as the "son of the blessed gods."[343] He also later writes a form of emperor worship and describes a farmer pouring libations to him.

Apart from allowing poets whom he patronized to deify him, Augustus further secured his divine lineage by founding a temple dedicated to *divus Julius* (the divine Julius) near Caesar's cremation site (Aug. *Res Gestae* 4.19.2)[344] and gave himself the title of *divi filius* ('son of the divine Julius).[345] Through this method, Augustus is only semi-deified through his link to his now divine father; just like in the literature of the poets he patronized, Augustus is never outright said to be a god by any individual with authority. He is only ever strongly connected to the gods in some way or another.

While the deification of emperors was common after their death, Ovid's form of Augustan depersonalisation through deification by comparison or equation to Jupiter comes across as excessive in its frequency, though not necessarily its type, and as such, can be seen as fulfilling a role that is not immediately obvious to the reader. Looking at scholars such as Ward,[346] it would appear that Ovid is the ancient poet who most often compares Augustus to Jupiter, although he seems to have taken some inspiration from other classical poets who use the theme, albeit sparingly. A motif which Ovid seems to enjoy emulating is one of refusal or proclamation

---

[341] Taylor (1931:235).
[342] Fraenkel (1957:9-10).
[343] I have used Kline's 2003 translation.
[344] Augustus uses the term *divi Iuli* to refer to Caesar.
[345] Syme (1939:202). The fuller form of this name, *divi Iuli filius,* is seen on an inscription on the *Porta Tiburtina* in Rome.
[346] See Ward (1933) for an interpretation of the links between Augustus and Jupiter in both Egypt (213-7) and Asia Minor (217-220).

of an inability to write of the exploits of Augustus or other epic stories because the gravitas of such events is too great for the skillset of the poet. This is also seen in Horace *Odes* 2.12, where Horace refuses to write about Augustus's exploits, which are as suited to lyric verse as other Gigantomachic events, and again in Propertius, who proclaimed that if he had the skill for the epic genre, he would have written of Augustus's exploits and not of the wars of Titans and Giants and other similar legendary and historical themes. However, he is unable to do so (Prop. 2.1.17-42). Ovid repeats this motif in *Tristia* 2.333-4, although he speaks of Augustus hypothetically ordering him to do so and stresses his inability to write on such heavy topics. It would seem that Ovid is elevating Augustus to the level of the heroes and gods of the epic genre by saying that he, an elegist, does not have the capability to write of him in all his glory, taking inspiration from poets such as Horace and Propertius.

Ovid chose to consistently depersonalise Augustus into a deity and equate him with a seemingly unjust god. McGowan speaks about how it was also slightly unusual to equate him so strongly and consistently with Jupiter as during his reign, he was more often equated rather with Mars and Apollo, gods who had played an important role in the establishment of the Augustan regime.[347] It is important to mention that Ovid's equation of Augustus to Jupiter extended to other royal family members, like Livia, who is made into Juno and Venus (*Pont*. 3.1.117-8, 145). However, Ovid more commonly deifies Livia and Tiberius than equating them to existing gods (*Pont*. 2.8.1-4; 4.9.107-8). Comparisons between Augustus and Jupiter were not entirely unheard of in other poets as in his *Odes*, Horace compares Augustus to a thundering Jupiter in a very similar way to Ovid (Hor. *Carm.* 3.5.1-4 cf Ov. *Tr.* 4.4.11-20). Comparisons between Augustus and Jupiter are seen sparsely in Propertius. In Propertius 2.7.1-6, neither Jupiter nor Augustus holds power over love (Prop. 2.7.1-6). Moreover, in Propertius 3.11.66, Rome need hardly fear Jupiter so long as Augustus is alive (Prop. 3.11.66). Tibullus also uses Gigantomachia to compare Augustus and Jupiter (Tib. 2.5.5-10).

Augustus himself shied away from being described as a living divinity within Rome at a state cult level,[348] as the Romans did not yet have a tradition of deifying living people. Dio Cassius says in his *Historia Romana* book LI 20 that "no [Roman] emperor, however worthy of renown he has been, has dared to do this". The "this" he speaks of seems to be the consecration of temples to himself as a living divinity, a statement supported by modern scholars such as

---

[347] McGowan (2009:68).
[348] Gradel (2002:112). See Taylor (1920) for an analysis of Augustus's willingness to be worshipped while alive.

Gradel.[349] Another possible reason for Augustus shying away from being deified at a state-cult level while still alive was to avoid the fate of his late adopted father, Julius Caesar.[350] Instead, he chose to give himself a divine lineage through Aeneas or his now-deified father instead of actually deifying himself. However, it must be noted that even the title or name "Augustus", which was given to him, was a form of minor deification.[351] Towards the end of his reign, in the outer reaches of the empire,[352] such as in Tomis, it was considered normal to worship him as a god pre-mortem[353] because in the western Romanised provinces, the imperial cult, worshipping both deceased emperors and currently reigning ones, played a large role in focusing loyalty on the emperor and the empire in an attempt to further Romanization and as such, the idea of this cult was introduced during the early developmental stages of a new territory.[354] The worship of currently reigning emperors was seen especially in the first and third centuries in these western provinces, as there was a decrease in this trend in the second century and the years following the third century.[355] The fact that the western provinces engaged in worshipping current emperors might have influenced Ovid's decision to depersonalise Augustus into Jupiter frequently. Other poets like Vergil and Horace also deified Augustus, but often only by suggesting, implying, or drawing parallels. They would often distinguish the emperor and the god, wherein the emperor was "like" Jupiter, ruling the earth, while Jupiter himself was a separate entity, ruling the heavens (Hor. *Odes* 1.12.49-60). Ovid does this too in *Tristia* 2.215-8, where he says that just as Jupiter, who watches over the heavens, does not have the time to notice lesser things, Augustus gazes around at the world that depends on him and does not have the time for inferior matters. The common form of literary reference during this time to Augustus's deification is also something that is alluded to as being bestowed upon him at his death and not a living title that he held.[356] Ovid took the equating of Augustus to Jupiter further than these other poets by writing about him as an active god with the powers of the deity he was equating him with, thus turning him into Jupiter himself.[357]

When referring to Augustus, Ovid almost always compares or parallels him to Jupiter. This is seen in *Tristia* 2.142-4, where Ovid describes a tree, once struck by Jupiter's thunderbolt,

---

[349] Gradel (2002:27).
[350] Gradel (2002:112-4).
[351] Florus (*Epit*. 2.34.66)
[352] See Fishwick (1991) for examples.
[353] Claassen (2016:73); McGowan (2009:63).
[354] Worship of the emperor was also common in the east (Jones 1963:11).
[355] Fishwick (1987:389-91).
[356] Gradel (2002:109-15, 261-304).
[357] McGowan (2009:65).

which is now healing (a hopeful reference to his situation without a direct reference to Augustus), and 2.215-8 when Ovid compares Augustus to Jupiter without equating them by saying that as Jupiter watches over the gods and the high heavens, not having time to notice lesser things, so do inferior matters escape his care as Augustus gazes around at the world that depends on him.

Conversely, it is important to note that almost all of the references to Jupiter actually describe or refer to Augustus in some way, with only three exceptions. Ovid refers to Jupiter without comparing or equating him to Augustus only three times in his exilic works, for example, in *Tristia* 2.289-90, where he talks to Augustus about adulterous events which take place in Jupiter's temple. A second instance is in *Tristia* 4.2.56, where Tiberius offers a votive wreath to Jupiter after his triumph, and the third in *Epistulae ex Ponto* 2.2.42, where Ovid speaks of Messalinus about him worshipping Jupiter.

All other references to Jupiter contain references or implications to Augustus. In *Tristia* 1.3.11, Ovid says that when he was leaving for exile, he was as dazed as a man struck by Jupiter's lightning. The reader-guide in *Tristia* 3.1 leads the book to Augustus's house and says that it is truly the house of mighty Jupiter after the book asks if the house is Jupiter's. In *Tristia* 4.4.17-20, Ovid speaks about Messalinus being safe in speaking about Augustus in his poetry, saying that Jupiter adds his divinity to poets' art and that this is why it is okay to speak about "these two deities", one which is and one which is thought to be a god, one being Jupiter and one being Augustus. In *Epistulae ex Ponto* 2.1.12-16, Ovid compares himself, when feeling happiness—although Augustus forbids it—to a weed enjoying the rain sent by Jupiter to delight the fields. In *Epistulae ex Ponto* 2.2.41-3, Ovid begs Messalinus to carry his words to "the gods of Rome", presumably the deified imperial family, who are worshipped no less by Messalinus than Jupiter. In *Epistulae ex Ponto* 4.4.33-4, while talking to Sextus Pompeius about his approval for the consulship, he states that Sextus will wish that all the gods might favour him, and that Jupiter and Augustus will do so. Jupiter and all the connotations surrounding him are directly linked to Augustus by Ovid, who inextricably links the two until a reference to one can almost always be taken to be referencing the other. The reader comes to view almost all references to Jupiter as references to Augustus, removing Augustus's humanity.

This trope is continued in an extremely common motif in Ovidian exilic literature where Ovid equates Augustus's relegation of him to Jupiter's lightning in some way, linking not only the beings to each other but their actions as well. This is seen in instances like *Tristia* 3.5.5-7, where Ovid refers to himself as the body which Jupiter's lightning struck and 4.3.69-70, where,

while speaking to his wife about his exile, he asks her not to blush because he has been struck by Jupiter's lightning after speaking to her about blushing to be an exile's wife. Other examples of this are seen throughout the exilic texts. Such as, after speaking about his fate granting Augustus the chance for mercy in *Tristia* 2.32-44, Ovid goes on to speak about how he would run out of weapons if Jupiter smote every man who sinned, how he often scares the world with the noise of thunder before clearing up rain clouds and how this is what makes him fit to be the father and ruler of all gods. Ovid then says that since Augustus is called the father and ruler of the land, he should follow suit to Jupiter before saying that Augustus already does follow suit to Jupiter by ruling with such great moderation by often granting defeated enemies mercy. This suggests that while Augustus has smitten Ovid as Jupiter does with his lightning, he should show leniency as Jupiter does. In *Tristia* 4.9.14-6, Ovid speaks of hoping that Augustus will allow him back home in the same way that even an oak tree blasted by Jupiter's lightning often grows again. In *Tristia* 5.2, Ovid begs Augustus to reduce the lightning bolt's effect a little and change Ovid's place of exile (53-4). In these examples, especially when Ovid asks Augustus to reduce the lightning bolt's effect, Ovid equates Jupiter's lightning and its effects to Augustus's relegation of Ovid and the exile's effects on Ovid. In this way, Ovid is depersonalising Augustus into Jupiter, as Jupiter's smiting of others is equated to Augustus's smiting of Ovid.

Ovid sometimes speaks about Augustus while implying a connection to Jupiter without referring directly to Jupiter in a comparison, such as in *Epistulae ex Ponto* 1.2.126, where Ovid says that Augustus hurls his rare lightning with an unwilling hand. This hesitancy to punish is referenced again in *Epistulae* 1.7.45-6, where Ovid says that Augustus spared him so far as circumstance allowed, using his lightning bolt with restraint. And again, in *Epistulae ex Ponto* 2.2.115-6, Ovid describes Augustus as a calm and merciful father inclined to pardon and often thunders without the flash of lightning, implying that Augustus often threatens punishment without actually punishing. In these instances, Augustus's status as Jupiter is accepted and no further explication is needed. The Augustus-Jupiter character has been fully formed. Augustus simply is Jupiter.

In these uses of this kind of Ovidian interpersonal depersonalisation, Ovid often shows an ambivalence towards Augustus as he is spoken of or at least alluded to as being lenient or cooperative (*Pont*. 2.9.25-6, 3.6.17-8) but is also negative towards him as Jupiter (Augustus) is described as flinging his thunderbolts at those who have done nothing to deserve it (*Pont*. 3.6.27-8). As stated before, this is probably indicative of the tricky situation Ovid finds himself

in since he both needs to flatter Augustus and appeal to him in an attempt to gain recall or a change of location. This probably also serves as a conscious attempt to lessen the chances of harsher punishment by not speaking ill of the emperor directly. However, Ovid also has the unconscious need to express his negative emotions and feelings towards Augustus by showing him in a negative light. Ovid fulfils this unconscious need by referring to Augustus as this unjust god and speaks about the two almost interchangeably.

It is important to note that Ovid did have moments in his exilic texts where he distinguished between Augustus and Jupiter, so the Augustus-Jupiter character was not the only way in which Ovid referred to Augustus. There are three ways Ovid refers to Augustus without typically depersonalising him, although he often breaks the mould and deifies Augustus using these methods. The first method is to refer to Augustus by using his name, the second is to refer to him as "Caesar", and the third is to refer to Augustus as "Prince". It is important to note that Ovid breaks the mould with all three of these terms by deifying Augustus while using them at least once. This could be simple adherence to following the imperial cult, but this consistent deification does strip Augustus of his humanity, depersonalising him into a god, albeit not necessarily Jupiter himself.

Ovid refers to Augustus using his name without deifying him sparingly in the *Tristia* as he only uses Augustus's name thrice (*Tr.* 1.2.102, 2.509, 4.4.53). This trend sharply increases to nine times in the *Epistulae ex Ponto* (*Pont.* 1.2.59, 115, 3.1.135), specifically in the fourth book (*Pont.* 4.5.10, 23, 6.15, 9.70, 13.25, 15.16). The reason for this could be that he was scared to overuse Augustus's real name for fear of retaliation or the implementation of a harsher punishment, but by the time the fourth instalment of the *Epistulae* had been written, Augustus had already died, and Ovid no longer needed to be so careful with using his name. Also, there was no established tradition of directly speaking to the emperor by using his name during his lifetime in the literature of the time, so Ovid's use of Augustus's name would have been seen as quite unusual.[358] Breaking this mould of non-deification, Ovid deifies Augustus using his name in *Tristia* 3.8.13 and *Epistulae ex Ponto* 3.1.163 and 4.6.10, where he refers to a "divine Augustus".

By far more often, Ovid refers to Augustus as Caesar without equating him to Jupiter.[359] However, there are moments when he deifies Augustus by implication while using the word

---

[358] Davis (1999:801).
[359] Instances of Ovid referring to Augustus as Caesar without referring explicitly to Augustus's anger are found at *Tr.* 1.2.65, 93, 104, 3.5, 5.39, 9.23; 2.7, 22, 27, 206, 209, 230, 335, 551, 560; 3.1.27, 75, 7.48, 12.45, 53;

Caesar when he prays to him (*Tr.* 3.1.78) and when he speaks about Augustus's divine will (*Tr.* 5.10.51-2). Ovid also explicitly deifies Augustus while using the word Caesar in *Epistulae ex Ponto* 1.2.71-2, 10.42 and 4.9.127.

Ovid sparingly referred to Augustus as *princeps* or "prince" while not deifying him, relating him to Jupiter, or referring to his anger (*Tr.* 2.128, 242, 464; 4.4.12, 5.8.35. *Pont.* 1.2.121, 4.57). However, Ovid does not consistently use this theme of referring to Augustus as a prince without referring to Jupiter, as there is an instance of Ovid referring to Augustus as a prince while comparing him to all gods, presumably including Jupiter, in *Epistulae ex Ponto* 3.6.23. Here, Ovid compares Augustus's leniency to that of the gods. In these lines, Augustus is compared to the gods while being referred to as a prince and not directly as a deific figure. This use of the word "prince" could have been a show of respect, an example of Ovid's possible fear of overusing Augustus's real name, a metrical choice or, most likely, a mixture of these and other reasons.

There are 25 times where Ovid deifies Augustus, using the word god,[360] without any reference to another god such as Jupiter. Examples of this are in *Tristia* 1.1.20, where he says the fact that he is even alive is a gift "from a god" (*dei*). This idea of Augustus granting Ovid life is repeated in the exilic texts at *Tristia* 5.4.22 and *Epistulae ex Ponto* 1.2.105-6, where he uses the word *dei* (god) and *numen* (godhead or divinity) as a deified form of Augustus. Another recurring motif is that of being injured or hurt by the god Augustus without receiving aid from another god. This is seen in *Tristia* 1.2 when Ovid begs the gods of the sea and sky for aid and not to add to Augustus's punishment, saying that often, when one god punishes, another brings help (4). He then goes on to list various literary figures who were hurt and aided by gods, and in *Tristia* 1.5.79, Ovid says that a god crushed him, and no one eased his pain, as opposed to Ulysses, who received aid from Minerva. The use of the word *numen* to mean god in *Epistulae ex Ponto* 1.2.105-6 further links to Gradel's theory that to worship the *numen* of the emperor is to worship the emperor himself since the *numen* cannot be personified.

These references to Augustus without equating him to Jupiter are important as they show that Ovid did not consistently rely on the Augustus-Jupiter character to refer to Augustus as the

---

4.2.47, 4.15, 5.8, 9.11; 5.2.38, 3.46, 5.61, 7.8, 9.11, 21, 11.19, 23. *Pont.* 1.1.27, 2.98, 113, 139, 8.24, 69; 2.*2.78, 93, 3.98, 7.55, 67, 8.1, 18, 37, 53, 9.34; 3.1.114, 128, 3.68; 4.4.34, 39, 5.32, 8.65, 9.106, 13.21, 35-6.
* *Pont.* 2.1 begins by referring to Tiberius as Caesar, as such, the other mentions of Caesar in this poem will not be counted as I cannot be sure who he is referring to.
[360] The word "god" is used in the English translation by Kline, but it is translated from *deus* and *numen*. Gradel notes that *numen* was synonymous with *deus* (Gradel 2002:7).

emperor. Such reliance on this metaphor might have been seen in a negative light by the emperor and those reading the texts due to how the Augustus-Jupiter character is often negatively depicted. Ovid needed to bring some humanity back to the emperor in some way to avoid negative repercussions. This is also possibly why Ovid makes scant use of deification without referring to Jupiter, showing that Augustus is a god in his own right who could be better than Jupiter in some way, complimenting him in an attempt to garner sympathy from him and Ovid's readers. I believe that by equating Augustus to a god, Ovid could appeal to Augustus's ego by speaking of him as though he were a god. Thus, Ovid emphasises Augustus's power and prestige while also implying that he was kind by outwardly removing any blame or fault from him.

Augustus's Anger[361]

The other way Ovid depersonalises Augustus, which has not received scholarly attention, is by removing his agency regarding Ovid's exile, both the sending of him into exile and recalling him from exile, and giving that agency to Augustus's anger through humanising verbs. The personification of emotions was not an unknown concept in the ancient world,[362] or even to Ovid, for that matter, as he was known to personify love in his love poems[363] and envy in his *Metamorphoses* and exilic works.[364] Augustus's anger is given agency through human verbs such as that it "granted" (*dedit, Tr*. 1.2.61-2) Ovid his life by "ordering" (*iubet, Tr.* 4.10.97-8) him to Tomis but did not "avenge" (*vindicet, Tr*. 3.8.40) Augustus's wrongs by executing Ovid even though it was justifiably "offended" (*offensus, Pont*. 2.3.61-2) by his actions. Ovid also asks if his birthday was "sent" (*misit, Tr.* 3.13.11-2) by Augustus's anger to Tomis. And in

---

[361] For an in-depth look into the prevalence of Augustus's anger as a non-personified concept in Ovid's exilic literature, see McGowan (2009).

[362] According to Hardie (1999), the Ovidian Envy is closely linked to Vergil's Fury, which was originally a fully mythological being which has almost been sublimated into a personification by Vergil (p. 97). See Feeney (1991) for a discussion on Vergil's Fury.

[363] Ovid does use "Love" as a proper noun to refer to the god *Eros* who comes to visit Ovid, possibly in a dream, in *Pont.* 3.3, but for the purposes of this dissertation it cannot be considered personification of emotion as it rather is a reference to a personified abstraction that had, at that point, been fully deified in Roman culture. See Park (2009) for a look into the Ovidian personification of Love in his love poetry both where it is a personified emotion and a deified abstraction.

[364] Envy is personified in *Tr.* 4.10.123-4, where Ovid uses Envy as a proper noun to speak about the emotion, saying that it has not attacked any of his works with "malignant teeth" and again in *Pont.* 4.16, where Ovid again uses the word as a proper noun to speak directly to the emotion, telling it to stop reviling him (*Pont.* 4.16.47) and scattering his ashes around (*Pont.* 4.16.48). Envy is personified without the use of a proper noun in *Pont.* 3.4.73-4. There it is described as hurting the living and gnawing with the tooth of injustice. Envy was also quite concretely personified by Callimachus. An example of this is shown in his *Hymn to Apollo* (1.5-113) where Envy whispers into Apollo's ear and is kicked by him. See Shiaele (2010) for an in-depth look into Callimachus's personification of Envy in his *Hymn to Apollo* and how it relates to Ovid's personification of envy in his *Metamorphoses*.

Epistulae ex Ponto 3.7.39-40, Ovid says that if Augustus's anger does not "forbid" (*negarit* him to, he will waste away bravely in Pontus.[365] Through the creation of this character, it is no longer Augustus who has exiled Ovid but his anger. There is an interesting moment in *Tristia* 1.5.78, where Ovid states that Jupiter's anger oppressed him, combining both kinds of depersonalisation.

Not every reference to Augustus's anger depersonalises him, as there are instances where Ovid uses Augustus's anger as a metonym for his punishment. While it is not always explicit whether Ovid is talking about Augustus's anger as being the one to send him to exile or Augustus's anger being a metonym for Ovid's punishment, there are some instances where it is clearly visible that Ovid is talking about Augustus's rage as being his punishment and not as an entity with its own agency. Ovid says that Augustus's anger stopped short of death (*Tr.* 2.126) and that it is lighter than he deserves (*Pont.* 1.2.96) for his offence (*Tr.* 5.2.60) as he is *relegatus* (*Tr.* 5.2.61), one who has been relegated, and not *exul* (*Tr.* 5.2.58), an exile. Ovid also speaks of enduring Augustus's anger while referring to his exile (*Tr.* 3.11.17-8. *Pont.* 1.10.19-20).

By depersonalising Augustus in these ways, Ovid can consciously and unconsciously fulfil several needs. Consciously, Ovid could speak ill of Augustus in his exilic poems without doing so openly, thus gaining some form of catharsis through literary revenge while protecting himself from further imperial retaliation. This action also fulfils an unconscious need for self-preservation by using the defence mechanism of displacement. The emperor is a real and dangerous person to Ovid as he is the one who holds power over him and his sentence. Augustus is the one who has the power to recall Ovid or lighten his sentence. Jupiter could not do this as a literary or deific figure, meaning that this depersonalisation created a less threatening target for Ovid's emotions than Augustus himself.

Ovid's reasons for linking Augustus with Jupiter are varied and complex, but on a simple level, it could be that Ovid wanted to link Augustus to a petty or unjust god. The Roman gods were viewed as far more powerful than people by everyday Romans. "[N]othing could be done without them or their agreement and support",[366] and as such, their peace and relative contentment were considered of the utmost importance. However, Ovid's treatment of the gods in his *Metamorphoses* as powerful yet imperfect beings who could be prone to petty outbursts,

---

[365] There is also a passing instance of Ovid comparing Augustus to a lion, dehumanising him into a beast while complimenting him on his similarity with a greater beast which does not worry its enemy after bringing it down, unlike lowly bears and wolves who will worry the dying (*Tr.* 3.5.33-5).

[366] Turcan (2001:5).

as seen in the Arachne tale, suggests a kind of irreverence towards them. I believe that when looking at how Ovid speaks about the two, to him, Jupiter was far less in control of his life and exile than Augustus was. Augustus is always placed next to Jupiter on a power spectrum, and it is possible that since Jupiter had never personally intervened in Ovid's life, Ovid feared Augustus more than he did Jupiter and, therefore, ascribed more power to him.

Another reason could be that, by linking Augustus so strongly to Jupiter with specific emphasis on his tendency to smite undeserving individuals (*Pont*. 3.6.27), Ovid strongly implies that he is innocent and underserving of his punishment. He could be insinuating either that he is underserving of punishment at all or that the severity of his punishment is underserved. The former, however, is unlikely as Ovid acknowledges the guilt of his *Ars* at multiple points in the exilic texts (i.e., *Pont*. 2.9.73-6).

A further explanation is laid out by Claassen, who surmises that Ovid's association of Augustus with Jupiter was actually a means of criticising him.[367] Jupiter was known for his many extramarital affairs, just as Augustus was. Arguably, Augustus did not want knowledge of his extramarital affairs to be openly known, as he ironically campaigned for family-oriented social reforms. Thus, the identification of Augustus with Jupiter can be seen as Ovid condemning Augustus for his lascivious past.[368]

However, the use of depersonalisation in this way does perform other more personal functions for Ovid, which may lie more in his unconscious use of these depersonalisations over time. Ovid can downplay the impossible situation he faces and comfort himself by assuming the mindset that it is not the all-powerful Augustus who has to decide to recall him but rather an emotion which can be tempered with time. This can be achieved when pleading with Augustus for lenience while also satisfying a personal need to demean Augustus by mocking him. This could probably provide a kind of catharsis at being able to attack his unjust oppressor in some way. Ovid's depersonalisation of Augustus into the Augustus-Jupiter character is a rather clear example of displacement, whereby Ovid creates a less threatening persona or entity through personification through which he can express his views and feelings about Augustus and his exile with little danger to himself, providing an outlet for his negative emotions. His depersonalisation of Augustus into his anger is a bit more complex as it is neither full displacement nor full condensation, but rather a combination of the two that involves more of

---

[367] Claassen (1999:227).
[368] Claassen (1999:237).

a downplaying of a situation, an expression of hope, than an outright expression of negative emotion. Using these depersonalisations, Ovid can give himself a modicum of hope and nurture it over time by insinuating that Augustus is a kind man and the only thing keeping Ovid in exile is the fact that Augustus's anger over his error had not cooled yet. This would mean that, in time, Ovid would have a chance at lenience if only he remained patient and strong while also providing a means to express his sense of hopelessness at being, in his eyes, unjustly punished by someone with a god-like level of power and authority over his life whom he has no hope of appealing to or persuading outright as an equal.

ii.   Pontus as Physical Oppressor

The other major oppressive character which Ovid constructs is the Pontus character. In her 1990 article, Claassen notes that from the beginning, the Getic shore is represented as deleterious, with puns on *sinister*/*Euxinus* being strengthened by frequent personification. Claassen notes that personification through the use of human words is common during the first five years of Ovid's exile; however, by the time Ovid is writing the last book of the *Epistulae*, the country, along with its river, has become fully personified, although Claassen states that this is not a wholly malevolent sentient being.[369] Claassen writes briefly of the simultaneous depersonalisation of the locals and personification of malevolent nature, speaking to Ovid's continuing wavering perception of reality.[370] But she does not explore what this could mean for Ovid, nor does she illuminate the reader on how this simultaneous personification and depersonalisation creates an oppressive character against which Ovid can rebel. In this section, I will explore the simultaneous personification of Pontus and the depersonalisation of the locals, creating one of Ovid's primary oppressive characters, Pontus, the physical oppressor.

Ovid simultaneously uses metaphor and metonymy to construct personified characters which influence his life. Ovid's complex interweaving of metaphor and metonymy as literary unconscious mechanisms can be seen when Ovid creates and uses his personified Pontus character, an oppressive character constructed through metaphor by mixing the personification of Ovid's place of exile with the depersonalisation of the locals in his place of exile. In various subtle ways, Ovid then personifies this symbol as a physical oppressor towards whom he can express his negative beliefs about his exile. What is also included, albeit in the subtext, are his complex feelings about his exile, such as his fear of the constant raids and the cold he must

---

[369] Claassen (1990:106-7).
[370] Claassen (1990:108-9).

endure (*Pont*. 1.7.11-2). This character provides Ovid with a less dangerous or threatening target for emotional expression, allowing him to safely displace his negative emotions relating to his exile through metonymy in a more socially acceptable way, as this manufactured oppressive character holds no actual power over Ovid's exile. Ovid can also link many aspects of his situation, compressing the many aspects of exile into a single symbol.

The town to which Ovid was exiled was named Tomis, and it was located in an area which Ovid refers to as Pontus, after the *Pontus Euxinus*, the Black Sea.[371] The region in which Tomis was located, often called "Scythia" by both Ovid and others,[372] was depicted by other poets as a utopia, far away from the dystopian city of Rome and all its pernicious luxury. The nature of the climate made agriculture and a sedentary life difficult, leading the inhabitants to a more nomadic life, which other Augustan Roman poets seemed to find very enticing.[373] The root of the typically idealised and positive view of the Scythians that the Romans had, which is expressed more openly through poets like Vergil and Horace, was due to their traditional virtues, traits which were seen as desirable if not necessary in all citizens to ensure a great empire. Several virtues come together to form this view, the biggest being *frugalitas*, to follow a simple life without luxury.[374] An example is when Horace describes the Scythians as living better than the Romans because of a heightened moral value in the absence of wealth (Hor. *Carm.* 3.24.9-11). According to Evans, Vergil is known for providing one of the most famous depictions of the area in his *Georgics* during the "Scythian digression" in Book 3, describing the region as being in a constant wintry state (Ver. *G.* 3.356), covered in snow and ice (Ver. *G.* 3.354-5), the temperature dropping to levels where icicles hung from Scythian beards (Ver. *G.* 3.366) and wine froze and was chopped off to be sold and consumed (Ver. *G.* 3.364-5).[375]

---

[371] Wheeler ([1924] 1988:xxvii).

[372] Ovid refers to the area often as "Scythia" (*Scythia, Tr*. 1.3.61; 3.2.1; 4.9.17. *Pont.* 1.3.37; 2.1.3; 3.2.45, 56, 96, 7.29; 4.6.5). He uses the word "Scythian" (*Scythicus, -a, -um*) to describe the area and its natural phenomena and inhabitants as well as their weapons (*Tr*. 1.8.40; 3.4.46,[372] 49, 11.53, 12.51, 14.47; 4.1.45, 6.47; 5.1.20, 2.62, 6.20, 10.14, 48. *Pont.* 1.1.79, 2.108, 7.9; 2.1.65, 2.110, 8.36; 3.8.19). This was almost certainly a deliberate decision on Ovid's behalf as his depictions of Tomis are designed to so closely mimic Vergil's depiction of Scythia. But Ovid does more commonly refer to Pontus by its name, *Pontus*, (*Tr*. 1.2.83, 94, 10.13, 31; 3.2.8, 4.46*, 8.27, 11.7, 13.11, 28, 14.50; 4.1.19; 5.2.1, 61, 5.32, 10.2, 13.21. *Pont.* 1.3.65, 4.27, 31, 9.6; 2.4.27; 3.1.7, 5.56, 8.17; 4.4.19, 7.7, 9.85, 113, 115, 119, 10.45, 12.34, 15.20), or use the word "Pontic" (*Ponticus, -a, -um*) to describe certain aspects of the place (*Tr*. 3.12.32; 4.10.47).

[373] Philbrook (2016:42).

[374] Walsh (1961:66).

[375] Evans (1975:1-2).

Vergil implies that due to this kind of life, the Scythians are happy and enjoy safe and peaceful leisure in subterranean caves (Ver. *G.* 3.375-8).[376]

Ovid's depictions of Tomis and its inhabitants, specifically in *Tristia* 3.10, are very similar to Vergil's as he also speaks of the constant winter (*Tr.* 3.10.14-6, *Pont.* 1.2.24-5), icicles and frost clinging to the locals' hair (*Tr.* 3.10.21-2) and frozen wine (*Tr.* 3.10.23, *Pont.* 4.7.8), although this depiction was hardly novel in Ovid's time.[377] However, Ovid changes the narrative by inserting the violence and barbarism of the locals, for example, stating that it is because of their violent, inhuman actions that agriculture is impossible (*Tr.* 3.10.68-70, *Pont.* 1.8.51-62). Ovid also closes the poem by saying that no happy man would ever choose to go to Scythia (*Tr.* 3.10.76). This contrasts Ovid's terrible Scythia and Vergil's idealised Scythia, differentiating the two after being described as so similar.

Ovid's depiction of his physical exilic landscape is an intentional exaggeration to form one side of a comparison between his idealized, utopian Rome and his inescapable, dystopian reality. The comparisons between the two seem to provide a form of catharsis as Ovid can capture and express his feelings about his place of exile more clearly through the provided context of his view of Rome and what home means to him, which he can contrast with what he is currently experiencing.

Ovid's depictions of Rome are equally dissimilar to his peers as, to other poets like Horace, Vergil, and Tibullus, the city of Rome was often considered to be a dystopian place from which one must escape into the countryside.[378] To Ovid, on the other hand, the city of Rome was the most idyllic place on earth that no sane man should ever want to leave (*Tr.* 1.3.61-2, 3.2.21, 7.52; *Pont.* 1.3.37). To Ovid, Rome is a tranquil city (*Tr.* 1.8.37), unlike Pontus (*Tr.* 3.10.54-69), where children gather flowers that grow spontaneously in the countryside while songbirds sing (*Tr.* 3.12.5-8), where wheat, vines, and trees grow (*Tr.* 3.12.11-5). In contrast, Pontus lies barren both agriculturally (*Tr.* 3.10.68-71) and naturally, with only wormwood growing spontaneously in the natural landscape (*Pont.* 3.1.23, 8.15-6). Springtime, something never

---

[376] For further reading on this topic, I would suggest starting with Livy as he covers Roman ethics throughout his history. However, secondary sources have summarised his thoughts: P. G. Walsh's *Livy: His Historical Aims and Methods* (1961) is a good place to start when looking for modern sources on Livy's ideas regarding traditional Roman virtues. See Lind (1972) for further-reaching discussion on Roman virtues.

[377] The earliest depiction of Pontus in a similar light, which became the accepted pattern of the typical ethnographic representation of Pontus, was in Herodotus 4.28 (Philbrook 2016:42).

[378] Philbrook (2016:43).

experienced in Pontus (*Pont.* 3.1.11),[379] is a time of ease in Rome with a string of festive days and an active forum (*Tr*. 3.12.17-8). It is when people participate in physical activities to enjoy it (*Tr*. 3.12.19-22) and when there are active theatres (*Tr*. 3.12.23-4). In contrast, Pontus arguably has none of these, as it does not even have a wealth of books for Ovid to read (*Tr*. 3.14.37). Notably, Ovid describes both Rome and the people of Pontus as "warlike" or being related to Mars, the god of war (*Martius* cf. *Marticola*; *Tr*. 3.7.51 cf. *Tr*. 5.3.22). However, there is a distinct difference in Ovid's views of the two as Ovid seems to view Rome's tendency for warmongering in a positive light, saying that she (Rome) gazes in victory from her hills on all the world (*Tr*. 3.7.51-2) while the Getae are consistently dehumanised and made out to be lesser humans (*Tr*. 1.11.31-2; 4.4.61-2; 5.7.46. *Pont.* 4.9.93-4), as well as being hated and complained about by Ovid for their warlike tendencies (*Pont*. 4.14.14).

Just as Ovid blends the rural and urban areas of Tomis and Pontus in his depictions, albeit with the intent to show that there is truly nowhere to escape to, so too, as Philbrook points out, does he do this with Rome in *Tristia* 3.12. However, the intent now is to show the beautiful landscape of Italy in spring with the countryside in full bloom without mention of crops or agriculture, providing the picture of spontaneous, beautiful growth sans human intervention.[380] Immediately after this beatific setting, Ovid paints an idyllic image of the city in a moment of joyous celebration and leisure. In this depiction, Ovid does not mention any violence or strife and paints all people allowed into Rome as truly happy, which is how Vergil had described the Scythians. Ovid describes lush city scenes along with the Roman countryside again in *Epistulae* 1.8, describing his friend, Sevérus, who is also the addressee of the poem, as being able to move freely between the two while musing about his friend's good fortune in life and the activities he is allowed to engage in because of it (*Pont*. 1.8.65-8). In this way, Ovid flips Vergil and other Roman poets' desires on its head. Being in Rome, they view Pontus from an externalised view as an idealized, inaccessible utopia, while Ovid, from his externalised view of Rome, views Rome as the idealized, inaccessible utopia.

Another way Ovid compares and contrasts Pontus and Rome is through the pre-existing personification of some aspects related to time passing, such as his and his wife's birthdays, through the use of the *Genius* or *Natalis*,[381] and the seasons in both Pontus and Rome. This

---

[379] Compare this to an instance of Ovid claiming that he does experience spring in Pontus. However, it is not spring as he knows it as all there is to define it, is that the snow and sea melt and water is no longer dug from a pool (*Tr*. 3.12.37-8).
[380] Philbrook (2016:43).
[381] Kline (2003:412).

Genius or *Natalis* is viewed as a kind of "birthday god", with both *Genius* and *Natalis* referring to the same entity, which was celebrated and worshipped, especially on an individual's birthday.[382] As seen earlier in this section, the *genius* of an individual is considered to be the individual's spiritual counterpart who watches over the individual, the *genius'* physical counterpart.[383] This is a personification of an aspect of time that existed long before Ovid was exiled. It is a pre-established convention, discussed by Argetsinger in her thesis on the *natalis*, as the individuals of late republican Rome celebrated at least three types of *dies natales*, with the cult of the personal *genius* dating back to the time of Plautus (Plaut. *Capt*. 2.2), with poets such as Pliny, Horace, and Martial celebrating the *natalis* of people who were important to them through the means of their poetry (Plin. *Ep.* 6.30; Hor. *Carm.* 1.1; Mart. *Epigr.* 9.52). The *natalis* of an individual, ranging from a common citizen to the emperor and the *natales* of temples and cities, were also celebrated on the anniversary of their creation. Even the accession days of the emperors, their *natales imperii*, were celebrated during the principate. It would seem that celebrating or worshipping the *genius* on its *dies natales* would be to obtain protection from the *genius* for another year. [384]

When speaking about the personified birthday deities, Ovid admonishes his own, which follows him to Tomis and worships his wife's, which stays with her in Rome. In *Tristia* 3.13 Ovid addresses the personified god of his birthday, *Natalis*, chastising it for coming with him to Tomis (*Tr.* 3.13.1-3), and makes use of an only once-seen complex personification of the character in which he talks about how it should have cut his life short, saying farewell along with his friends in Rome (*Tr.* 3.13.10), if it truly cared for him or had any shame (*Tr.* 3.13.5-7). He asks it what it has to do with Pontus and if Augustus also exiled it (*Tr.* 3.13.11-2). He tells it not to expect the usual celebrations it had become accustomed to while Ovid lived in Rome (*Tr.* 3.13.13) as his situation and times are not such that he can be joyful at its arrival (*Tr.* 3.13.19-20). He then begs it to never return to Pontus (*Tr.* 3.13.26). Since the *natalis* provided protection for the individual who worshipped it, Ovid's claimed inability or unwillingness to worship it with its customary rites and his desire for it never to return suggest an ideation of death as he is in an admittedly deadly place and refuses to worship it and bring on another year of protection from it.

---

[382] Wheeler ([1924] 1988:503).
[383] Wheeler ([1924] 1988:503).
[384] Argetsinger (1992:175-8).

This birthday god, the *natalis*, is seen again in *Tristia* 5.5, where Ovid's wife's *natalis* returns and demands its customary honours (*Tr.* 5.5.1). This meeting is almost the exact opposite of Ovid's birthday as he calls it the best of birthdays, bright, unlike his own (*Tr.* 5.5.13). Instead of begging it never to return as he does with his own birthday, Ovid begs it to be radiantly here in Pontus with him, though he is far away (*Tr.* 5.5.14).

Apart from the instance of referring to the *natalis* as a way to express a death wish, it is possible that, to some degree, Ovid made use of the personification of one's birthday to the same ends as his other self-made personifications, as a way to comfort himself by creating living entities to fill the space around him that interact with him and with whom he can interact as these entities can be either negative or positive and continue to fulfil their psychological role for him regardless of how he feels about them. However, the birthday god is far more ambiguous than other personifications, such as the Pontus character, and is actually closer to Ovid's Comforting Muse character as the birthday god is both loved and hated by Ovid. Thus, the comparison between Pontus and Rome is continued through these personifications as Ovid loves his wife's birthday because it is the birthday of someone whom he loves. Its arrival symbolises the continued vitality and possible comfort of his wife in Rome, while his own signifies his continued painful and tenuous life of exile in Pontus.

An additional way Ovid compares Pontus and Rome is by personifying the seasons of the two locations. In his exilic texts, Ovid personifies the seasons regularly, although winter sees far more personification than all other seasons combined. Again, this is hardly a new personification as the Romans had the god Vertumnus, who presided over the seasons, while the gods Hiems, Flora, Aestas, and Autumnus presided over winter, spring, summer and autumn, respectively. However, Ovid consistently chooses to personify the season itself as doing something instead of using the pre-existing deified versions of each season or the seasons as a whole. The winter season is often personified as an oppressive character as it is so intrinsically linked to Ovid's view of Pontus. It is often complexly personified and interwoven into Ovid's depictions of Pontus, such as when winter shows its "squalid face" (*squalentia… ora; Tr.* 3.10.9) or holds dolphins back from breaching out of the waves if they try (*Tr.* 3.10.43). The winter season is covered extensively in *Tristia* 3.10, with most of the passage containing descriptions of it in some way, albeit not always through personification. Winter is personified in passing in both *Tristia* 3.8.29-30, where it "strikes" (*percussis*) the autumnal leaves with frost, *Tristia* 5.10.8, where winter cannot shorten (*efficit angustos*) the days further and at

Epistulae 4.13.39-40 where his sixth winter "sees" (*videt*) him suffering.[385] However, the lines between winter as an aspect of the Pontus character and winter as an aspect of time are blurred. These are examples of a simpler, lone-standing form of personification of winter that can be used to compare Ovid's feelings about Pontus to his feelings about Rome when contrasted with how Ovid refers to the different seasons in his exilic texts.

Winter as a season receives the most attention, yet Ovid never mentions winter as taking place in Rome, only near-omnipresent in Pontus. The other seasons receive far less attention from the poet when compared to Ovid's treatment of winter. This is understandable given that Ovid is especially fearful of and hateful towards the season so far removed from the more temperate climate of Rome and as Ovid is trying to portray Tomis as a place perpetually blanketed in winter to increase the reader's sympathy towards him (*Pont.* 1.2.24-5).

Winter as a personification is mentioned seven times, while the other seasons are mentioned as personifications five times altogether. Ovid writes that his skin is like autumn leaves which have been struck by winter (*Tr.* 3.8.30), possibly showing how the "constant" winter in Pontus has affected him. Later he writes that winter is making the sea a pathway for travellers (*Pont.* 4.10.32). In this section, Ovid shows how winter aids the barbarian raiders, who can now travel to Pontus and raid it indiscriminately. As mentioned above, winter is also described as having a squalid face (*Tr.* 3.10.9) and holding the dolphins back from breaching out of the waves (*Tr.* 3.10.43). This depicts winter as a dirty entity that stops those who are supposed to be free from enjoying their lives, just as it is currently doing to Ovid. Ovid also says that winter cannot shorten the days (*Tr.* 5.10.8).

Interestingly, the winter cannot be as overpowering as Ovid often describes it, as he seems to track time using winters, implying that there were definite seasons he could distinguish from one another, saying that a fourth winter "wearies" (*pugnantem, Pont.* 1.2.25)[386] him and that a sixth winter "sees" (*videt, Pont.* 4.13.40) him exiled. That winter would be wearying Ovid is understandable as he is unused to the constant frigid temperatures, having grown up near and

---

[385] Claassen (1990:106).

[386] The word *pugno* refers to contending in a battle or fight (*OLD*, s.v. "*pugno*" 1a) or to strain or fight against a physical force or obstacle (*OLD*, s.v. "*pugno*" 2c). While "wearies" is not a direct translation, it is arguable that the constant battle against the winter is wearying Ovid as multiple translations use variations of the word in this case. For example, Green translates lines 25 and 26 as "Here, struggling with cold, with arrows, with my grim fate, I'm drained of strength by this fourth season". An alternative, proposed by Kline, is translated as "Here a fourth winter wearies me, contending as I am with cold, with arrows, and with my own fate." Additionally, Wheeler translates these lines as: "Here am I fighting with cold, with arrows, with my own fate, in the weariness of the fourth winter."

lived in Rome for such a long time. This means that the cold serves as a constant and painful physical and psychological reminder of his disconnection from his home.

There are two references to summer in the exilic texts that can be seen as instances of personifications of the season. Summer does not "shorten" (*aufert, Tr.* 5.10.7) Ovid's nights in Pontus, , and "failed" (*defuit, Pont.* 2.10.38) Macer and Ovid by its days being too short in Rome. In these references to summer, the season cannot overcome the oppression of Pontus by shortening the nights, signifying the ever-present winter lengthening the nights. Spring and Autumn are both mentioned in passing in *Epistula* 3.1, where Ovid speaks to Pontus, saying that it will never see Spring wreathed in flower crowns (*tu neque ver sentis cinctum florente corona, Pont.* 3.1.11) nor be offered clusters of grapes by Autumn (*nec tibi pampineas autumnus porrigit uvas; Pont.* 3.1.13). One of Ovid's references to summer relates back to the cold of Pontus and, as such, is shown in a negative light, being unable to overcome the oppressive darkness of Pontus (*Tr.* 5.10.7), which would be terrible for Ovid as he is plagued by nightmares (*Pont.* 1.2.43), but even when he has pleasant dreams, he is still forced to live his nightmare out in Tomis (*Pont.* 1.2.47). Ovid's last depiction of summer is a positive yet wistful one, as the long summer days of Rome were not long enough for him and his friend (*Pont.* 2.10.38). In these examples, Ovid is comparing Pontus to Rome, showing that even the seasons cannot overcome the oppressive darkness of Pontus. In contrast, in Rome, it makes the days much longer, albeit not long enough for all the fun which could be had. Ovid's depiction of the other two seasons is positive as well, as he is describing the seasons as he remembered them in Rome. Yet there is a slight implication of the negative as Ovid goes on to say that all the seasons are gripped by the immoderate cold of Pontus (*Pont.* 3.1.14), showing again that even something as elemental and unconquerable as the passage of time expressed through the seasons cannot overcome the all-encompassing cold of Pontus. In this way, Ovid may be striving to drive home to the reader just how miserable Pontus is to him (*Tr.* 3.2.8. *Pont.* 1.3.50; 2.7.72).

This positive-to-negative comparison between Rome and Pontus is seen in Ovid's use of the personification of the concept of a birthday and his personification of the seasons. Ovid is joyous about his wife's birthday in Rome and sad about his birthday in Pontus, just as he feels negative emotions about the seasons in Pontus and positive emotions about the seasons in Rome. This could be an expression of the externalized view of the utopian Rome that Ovid

depicts in his exilic poems.[387] While not an act of season-based personification, Ovid's depiction of springtime in Rome in *Tristia* 3.12 is an excellent example of his idealised view of Rome as opposed to his depiction of the winter in Pontus in *Epistulae* 1.8, which serves as a companion poem to *Tristia* 3.12, according to Philbrook.[388] I believe that a better comparison showing Ovid's views towards the seasons in Rome and Pontus is seen when comparing *Tristia* 3.12 to *Tristia* 3.10, as Ovid clearly describes the bitter weather conditions in Pontus in *Tristia* 3.10.8-53 while in *Epistulae* 1.8, Ovid recalls Rome (*Pont*. 1.8.35-8) and muses over taking on agricultural activities in Pontus, if only the fierce barbarian enemy would allow it (*Pont*. 1.8.49-62).

Constructing the Pontus character: The Place and the People

The Pontus character is one of Ovid's more complex personifications, which recurs throughout his exilic works. However, it is not granted full human sentience and is rather given an agency and motivations similar to a personified animalistic, cruel and beast-like entity. Ovid does not seem to blame the character for his exile or situation as it cannot be spoken to or reasoned with like some of his other personifications. It is merely a symbol of his exile, which he can openly criticise and against which he can rebel. The oppressive Pontus character is a personification of Ovid's exile created through metaphor and metonymy, but it also encompasses other personifications and depersonalisations, which are integral aspects of Ovid's experience of his exile. The Pontus character is unique in its construction as not all aspects of it are personified at once and at all times. The components which the character is made of are the physical environment, namely, the landscape and natural phenomena, and the local inhabitants. It is possible that this linking of the two is because, during the warmer months, the Danube keeps the Sarmatians and Getae, the barbarian raiders, at bay. Thus, when the seemingly ever-present winter arrives and freezes the waters protecting Pontus from them, so do the raids.[389]

The Pontus character itself is alluded to through speaking of it in terms of its torturing him and its cruelty, but the portrait of it is painted by and large by the two main components that Ovid focuses on as they both colour the nature of the beast. Both of these aspects work in tandem to create the bulk of the torture that Scythia inflicts upon Ovid. The Pontus character is first seen and created in *Tristia* through both simple and complex personification techniques discussed

---

[387] The concept of the externalised view of Utopian Rome is covered in detail in Philbrook (2016).
[388] Philbrook (2016:44).
[389] Green (2005:246).

in the introduction of this dissertation. Simply put, the character is constructed through verbs, nouns, and adjectives normally reserved for a living entity.

The Pontus character can "see" (*aspicat, Tr*. 1.2.94) Ovid. It also "sees" (*videt, Pont*. 4.9.105) his shrine to the imperial cult as well as the barbarian raiders (*Tr*. 3.10.69). It can also feel emotions as it "fears" (*metuit, Tr*. 3.10.69) unseen barbarian raiders. It is often described as "holding"[390] Ovid or, passingly, "binding" (*vincta, Pont*. 3.1.15) Pontus's waves, albeit in ice. This character can also "take" (*capit, Tr.* 1.3.83) Ovid and "scare" (*terrebor, Tr*. 1.11.25) him. It "clings" (*haeret Tr*. 2.200) to the very edge of the Roman Empire, but is also capable of more complex actions, as in *Tristia* 5.12.52, where Ovid asks a friend to consider if Pontus "equips" (*arma*) him for poetry. This slight degree of sentience is echoed in a verb such as *scire* ("know"*, Pont*. 4.9.115). Ovid seems ambivalent towards this character as he states that its water and place "harm" (*nocent, Pont.* 1.10.35) him, a common complaint, but then goes on to ask it to protect him presumably from the barbarian raiders in *Epistulae ex Ponto* 2.9.66.

The Pontus character has "jaws" (*fauces, Tr.* 1.10.31) which are guarded by Byzantium's shores. In the *Epistulae,* it is described as having a "clean face" (*faciem… tecti, Pont.* 1.2.23-4), covered with neither shrubs nor trees. This reference could suggest a more human-like appearance, and the frozen river Danube is described as a "back" (*terga, Pont*. 1.2.80), possibly of the Pontus character, as the Danube is an integral part of Pontus in Ovid's eyes.

The Pontus character's adjectives give it more of a malicious and animalistic feel as the Black Sea is described as "sinister" (*sinister, Tr*. 1.8.38). This use of the word *sinister* to describe the Black Sea and its Pontic shore is a recurring motif. The Black Sea and, more specifically, its shores, are referred to as *sinister* four times in the exilic texts (*Tr*. 1.8.38; 4.8.42; 5.10.14. *Pont*. 2.2.2).[391] The use of the word *sinister* could be a fun play on words as it can mean "to the left-hand side" or to be "harmful" or "baleful", or "unfavourably situated".[392] This play on words stems from Pontus geographically being on the left shore of the Black Sea, its being a baleful and harmful place to Ovid, and being unfavourably situated in an area that is so cold. Ovid also describes Pontus as having an "unfriendly" (*inhospita, Tr*. 3.11.7) coast, being hostile (*hostica, Pont*. 1.3.65), being "sadder" (*tristior, Pont*. 2.7.63-4) than any other land and being "hateful"[393]. The coast is described as "barbarous" (*barbara*) and "used to savage rapine"

---

[390] *habet* (*Tr.* 3.2.8, 4.46, 13.28); *cohibent* (*Tr.* 4.4.55-6).
[391] *sinistri* (*Tr.* 1.8.38), *sinistra* (*Tr.* 4.8.42, 5.10.14. *Pont.* 2.2.2).
[392] *OLD* 2, s.v. "*sinister*" 2a; cf. 4a & 4b (Glare 2012).
[393] *odio* (Pont. 2.1.4); *invisus* (Pont. 4.12.33).

(*adsueta rapinae, Tr*. 1.11.31). Pontus and its surroundings are often referred to as barbarous by Ovid in the exilic texts, breathing a wild life into a non-living concept (*Tr*. 3.3.46, 11.7; 5.1.71, 2.31. *Pont*. 4.2.38). In *Tristia* 4.1, Pontus, or Tomis itself (this is unsure), is described as "anxious" (*sollicitae, Tr*. 4.1.85), a rare moment of ambivalence towards the character and a moment of weakness from the character. This highlights how fearful Ovid was of the barbarian raiders, as even the savage Pontus character fears them.

More complexly, Ovid makes use of pronouns to imply life. This is seen in the exilic texts through the use of the words *tuus* and *tu*. In *Tristia* 5.5.32, Ovid speaks directly to Pontus using the pronoun "your" when speaking of smoke fleeing Pontus's skies with a purpose. In *Epistulae ex Ponto* 3.1, Ovid speaks directly to Pontus, using the pronouns "you" and "your" again, saying that by its leave, if it has any to give (*tua, Pont.* 3.1.7), he would call it the worst feature of his harsh exile, telling Pontus that it aggravates his trouble (*tu, Pont.* 3.1.9-10). He tells it that it never experiences spring and never sees reapers (*tu, Pont.* 3.1.11-2) and that autumn never offers it clusters of grapes (*tibi, Pont.* 3.1.13). Through the use of these techniques, Ovid personifies the natural landscape of Pontus into a character.

Now, apart from "holding" Ovid and "harming" him, how else does this character oppress Ovid? The image Ovid paints of Pontus is an overall bleak one, a "barbarous place" (*Tr*. 3.14.30) invented for his punishment (*Tr*. 3.10.78). Once the snow falls, no rain or sunlight melts it since the north wind keeps everything frozen. Often, the snow lingers for two years (*Tr*. 3.10.13-6).[394] Wine freezes solid into the shape of its vessel, rivers freeze over, and water is dug out from frozen pools (*Tr*. 3.10.23-6, 12.28). The Danube (*Tr*. 3.10.27-30, 52, 12.30; 5.10.1. *Pont*. 1.2.79; 4.7.10) and sea (*Tr*. 3.10.39, 52, 12.29. *Pont*. 3.1.16, 4.9.85-6, 10.32, 38) freeze over and people cross the river on foot and via horseback (*Tr*. 3.10.31-39, 12.29-30. *Pont*. 1.2.80; 4.7.10, 10.32). Ovid described marine life, such as fish and dolphins, frozen in and under the ice (*Tr*. 3.10.43-4, 49). This imagery depicts a bleak wintery landscape which traps everything, including water, animals and people. This is a good indication of his own feelings of being trapped in Pontus as its prisoner.

The sea is described as like a pool or stagnant swamp due to all the rivers that flow into it, and its colour is barely blue (*Tr*. 4.10.47-61). The land of Pontus lies barren (*Pont*. 4.10.31) and abandoned as people fear the barbarian incursions (*Tr*. 3.10.67-70; 5.10.23-4. *Pont*. 1.7.13,

---

[394] Ovid does describe spring in Pontus in *Tr*. 3.12.27-30 after having stated that Pontus does not experience spring in *Tr*. 3.1.11.

8.51-62; 3.8.6). There are no grapevines or any other kind of fruit (Tr. 3.10.71-4, 12.14-6; *Pont.* 3.8.14), there are no shrubs (*Pont.* 1.2.23) and the only trees that grow are acrid wormwood (*Tr.* 5.13.21; *Pont.* 3.1.23, 8.15).[395] There are even no mines for precious metals in Pontus (*Pont.* 3.8.5). The imagery linked to the resources of the land shows how barren it is in all aspects.

In *Tristia* 3.3.7-12, Ovid says that he cannot stand the climate of Pontus, he is not used to the water, and he is not sure why, but the land displeases him. He claims that there is no house suitable for a patient, Ovid was sick at the time, and no doctors or friends could bring any comfort. Ovid also claims that the food is of no use. This shows that Ovid feels the land is unsuited to human habitation, signifying a belief that it is cruel to send him to a place that cannot sustain his life instead of sentencing him to a quick death.

The second aspect of the character is also explored in this poem with Ovid's depersonalised locals, both Tomitian and neighbouring barbarian tribes and raiders, whom he strips of their humanity to show them as beastly in a comparison to himself and other "civilised" Romans.[396] Ovid does differentiate between the locals of Pontus to a degree as he describes himself as living among the barbarian races of the Tomitae (*Pont.* 4.9.97, 14.15, 23, 47), Sarmatae (*Tr.* 3.3.6, 10.5, 12.29; 4.1.94, 10.110; 5.1.73, 5.7.13. *Pont.* 1.2.77; 2.2.93; 3.2.37; 4.10.26.), Bessi (*Tr.* 3.10.5; 4.1.67), Iazyges (*Pont.* 1.2.77; 4.7.9), Basternae (*Tr.* 2.198), Scythians (*Tr.* 3.1.55), Sintians (*Tr.* 4.1.22), Coralli (*Pont.* 4.2.38), Ciziges, Colchi and Teretei (*Tr.* 2.191). Ovid also passingly refers to Greeks and their descendants (*Tr.* 5.7.11, 10.28, 33. *Pont.* 4.14.47-8).

The relevance of this is that Ovid makes it clear that he knows the difference between and can differentiate between the various groups and tribes of the area in which he is exiled. However, he seems to indiscriminately call several of these groups Getae or Sarmatian, possibly as an insult as these are the main two "barbarian" enemies that Tomis seems to be raided and attacked by most often. According to Green,[397] the Getae were a Thracian tribe, later acquiring the name

---

[395] What is important to note is that in other poems, Ovid says that no trees grow in Pontus at all (Pont. 1.2.24), but later states that, apart from the wormwood trees, there are elms, just that there are no vines that clothe them (Pont. 3.8.13). Ovid also stresses the barrenness of Pontus but goes on to state that there are brambles (Pont. 4.4.4).
[396] Green (2005:399-400).
[396] Green (2005:418-9).
[396] Kline (2003:451).

Daci, whom Herodotus considered of superior intelligence (Hdt. 4.92). The Sarmatians were nomadic Indo-European horse herders and riders closely related to the Scythians.[398] According to Kline, Sarmatia was a general name for Europe north of the Black Sea and east of the Carpathians.[399]

The Getan and Sarmatian raiders are consistently described as riding horses and using poison- or venom-dipped arrows (*Tr*. 3.10.55, 63; 4.1.77; 5.7.16. *Pont*. 1.2.16; 3.1.26; 4.7.36, 9.83, 10.31). Ovid often calls both the people living in and around Tomis and those who attacked it as Getae and Sarmatians and only explicitly differentiates Tomitans from the Getae and Sarmatians when complimenting them in *Epistulae ex Ponto* 4.9.97 and once called out by the Tomitae for his descriptions of Pontus and the Pontic peoples in *Epistulae ex Ponto* 4.14. Ovid's indiscriminate use of these terms to refer to friend and foe could have been an attempt at garnering sympathy in Rome by implying that the enemy had both surrounded him and was currently living inside Tomis's walls.[400] He even says in *Tristia* 3.10.4 that he lives among the barbarian races, not differentiating between Tomitans and the Getae and Sarmatians.

Just as Vergil did, Ovid describes these Getae as only visible from the face up as they keep out the cold with trousers and furs (*Tr*. 4.6.47), with icicles and frost in their hair and beards (*Tr*. 3.10.19-22). In a further depiction of their savagery, the local Getae worked by a system of "might is right", where justice yielded to force (*Tr*. 5.7.47).[401] The barbarian raiders are compared to wild beasts, such as ravaging wolves (*Tr*. 4.1.79; 3.11.12, *Pont*. 1.2.18) and bears (*Tr*. 3.11.11). In *Tristia* 5.7.46, he even says that the people of Pontus have more cruel savagery than wolves, and later, in 5.12.55, Ovid says that everywhere in Pontus, it is filled with barbarism and the cries of beasts. It is possible that he is referencing the people of the area here. However, these locals, most notably the raiders, are more commonly referred to as barbarian or barbarous (*Tr*. 3.1.18, 9.2, 10.4; 4.1.82; 5.1.46, 2.67, 7.20, 10.28-9. *Pont*. 2.7.70)[402], a word to denote uncivilised or un-Roman peoples who were possibly considered as less than the

---

.
[400] See Batty (1994) for an in-depth look into the similarities and differences between the Getae, Scythians and Sarmatians in Ovid's contemporaries' works.
[401] Batty (1994:91).
[402] *barbara* (*Tr*. 3.1.18; 5.1.46, 2.67, 10.28), *barbaria* (*Tr*. 3.9.2, 10.4), *barbarus* (*Tr*. 4.1.82; 5.7.20. *Pont*. 2.7.70).

civilized Roman individual.[403] This seems to be the case in Ovid's mind as, while he feared the barbarians, he does not seem to consider them his equals or greater than himself.

Ovid complains that he has no supply of books in Tomis to feed his inspiration. All that there is in Tomis are bows and armour (*Tr*. 3.14.37-8). He recites his verse, but there is no one around to give him an "intelligent hearing". There are no people he can go to when he is at a loss for a word, name, or location (*Tr*. 3.14.39-44). There is no one for Ovid to recite his verses to as there are no people whose ears appreciate Latin words (*Tr*. 3.11.9; 4.1.100-1). It would seem that the languages spoken in Tomis were an altered Greek (*Tr*. 5.2.68, 7.51), Getic (*Tr*. 5.2.68, 7.52, 12.58. *Pont*. 3.2.40) Sarmatian (*Tr*. 5.7.56, 12.58. *Pont*. 3.2.40), Thracian and Scythian (*Tr*. 3.14.47), leading his Latin to grow rusty over time (*Pont*. 4.7.57-8). Ovid's experience of language while in exile was a difficult one as, according to him, almost no one spoke Latin (*Tr*. 5.2.67, 7.53-4, 10.38-9. *Pont*. 3.2.40). So, over time, he learns Getic and Sarmatian (*Pont*. 3.2.40). In *Tristia* 3.14.48, Ovid begins to consider writing a poem in "Getic". He eventually does write a Getic poem about Augustus by *Epistulae ex Ponto* 4.13. Knowing that Ovid has gone from being a major Roman poet to a linguistic barbarian, needing to communicate through gestures (*Tr*. 5.10.35-6), it is possible that one of Ovid's reasons for depersonalising the locals is one of petty psychological displacement of the anger of becoming, in a way, lesser than the barbarians with whom he is forced to live.

These two parts combine to form Ovid's full metaphor for his life in exile and just how different it is from the life he enjoyed in Rome. Both the location and people are beastly, and they are both used by the Pontus character to oppress Ovid and fill him with the terror that comes with their biting cold and savage raids.

4.5   Conclusion

Ovid makes use of depersonalisation and repersonification, or sometimes depersonalisation on its own, in various ways to express his reaction to exile, from removing his own culpability or complimenting loved ones to creating insanely powerful and fierce oppressors who dictate his exilic life both from a distance and physically. I believe that, by depersonalising himself, Ovid was unconsciously trying to find a way to distance himself from the negative emotions he was feeling as a result of his exile and the actions he took that led to it. While doing this, Ovid was also trying to comfort himself about his terrible situation by either not existing or by identifying

---

[403] *OLD* 2, s.v. "*barbarus*" 1a & 2a (Glare 2012).

with non-human objects and entities, which, arguably, could experience the torment he did. Regarding his depersonalisation of others, it is difficult to understand why someone as lacking in human comforts as Ovid might choose to remove the few true humans from his life while simultaneously striving to create so many more personified non-humans with whom he could interact. Following Epley et al.'s proposition, it is possible that Ovid either did not want to understand those in Rome and Tomis, or he did not believe he would ever interact with those in Rome again and did not want to interact with the people of Pontus.

Due to the various types of depersonalisation seen in Ovid's exilic texts, there are also many reasons why he depersonalises people. But, simply put, it can be said that he depersonalises as a direct response to being exiled, removing humanity from people whom he either could not see it in, such as the emperor Augustus and the people of Pontus, or from those whom he would rather not have to suffer normal, human, reactions to his exile, like himself and his loved ones, whom he believed he would never see again.

Chapter 5: Conclusions

The study of Ovid's creation of characters, through the use of personification and depersonalisation as coping mechanisms for the trauma of his exile, leads to several important conclusions. These characters perform psychological functions for him by helping or hindering his continued existence. They do this through emotionally comforting him, as his Comforting Muses do. They can also physically oppress him in his time of need, as both the Augustus-Jupiter and Pontus characters do. Or they can help him with his ultimate exilic goal: recall or relocation, as the Book-as-Child does.

Ovid's reasons for creating these characters were influenced by the circumstances of his exile. Ovid's exilic experience was entirely foreign and traumatic, leading him to experience severe isolation and loneliness and other negative emotions and feelings, such as guilt and depression. These emotions and feelings, along with the prolonged isolation, led to a decline in his mental state, which he experienced physically through bodily symptoms and psychologically through a mental decline. The reader knows of these symptoms because he tells us, both consciously and unconsciously through his own writing, of the symptoms he experienced and his use of the literary techniques of personification and depersonalisation to create characters.

The characters created using the techniques of personification and depersonalisation helped him cope both consciously and unconsciously with the trauma of exile. Ovid could shift the negative emotions he did not want himself or others to feel onto personified objects and concepts; he could manipulate his readers and loved ones into helping him with his goal of recall or relocation; and he could, both subtly and openly, rebel against those whom he viewed as real or created oppressors.

Ovid comforted himself in two main ways through personifying aspects of poetry. These personified characters supported him emotionally and with his goals. His Comforting Muses are the personification of poetry as a whole and sometimes Ovid's poetry specifically, or even a personification of the act of writing. They are the creators of his works, whom he can somewhat blame for causing his exile, and his close friends, who keep him hopeful and motivated while providing him with an outlet for his emotions. His works, personified in his children, also help him, primarily with the goal of changing his location, by acting as the mourning children of a deceased individual, or through the silent threats of vengeance of an accused in a court of law. He has a relatively ambivalent view of these sets of personified

characters for three main reasons. Poetry was partly the cause of Ovid's exile, thus, poetry personified becomes somewhat of an enemy or, at the very least, a party to shift the blame for causing exile onto. However, this is seen far more with the Comforting Muse characters. Conversely, poetry was also Ovid's only escape from the horrors of exile as he could travel to and live vicariously in Rome through poetry, and a continuous output of poetry acted as a salve for Ovid's declining mental state. Additionally, the poetry sent back to Rome, in the form of letters, was Ovid's only means of negotiating a recall or relocation, Ovid's ultimate exilic goal.

However, despite his mild ambivalent attitude towards them because of poetry's role in his banishment, Ovid more often portrays his Comforting Muse and Book-as-Child characters in a more positive light than he does with his characters created through a combination of depersonalisation and personification. These characters appear frequently in the *Tristia*. However, they become less prevalent in the *Epistulae*, with one of his comforters, his Comforting Muse, beginning to desert him as he loses hope and inspiration and his references to his book-children dwindling around the same time, possibly for similar reasons. On a more technical level, there is very little metonymy involved in the creation of the comforting characters as, psychologically, they do not pose a threat to him in the way the other characters and their original inspirations do.

Ovid's use of depersonalisation, in turn, is varied and nebulous. In its most complex form, it is typically used in conjunction with some personification and significant use of metaphor and metonymy to create powerful and inhuman oppressors for Ovid to rebel against and gain catharsis from the act of rebellion through a stripping of the humanity which Ovid cannot see in the individuals involved. While gaining this catharsis, Ovid is also consciously attempting to manipulate or persuade Augustus, or his readers, into working towards allowing Ovid back into Rome or to another, milder location. But in simpler forms, Ovid's simultaneous depersonalisation and repersonification provide a method for Ovid to express better or alleviate complicated negative emotions, removing the humanity and human reactions from those he would rather not consider as having it and further attempt to persuade those who will listen to aid him in his ultimate goal.

Unless he is depersonalising himself into something which is not alive, Ovid's depersonalisation is often accompanied by some kind of personification. This constant parallel of personification and depersonalisation suggests a link between the two, linguistically and psychologically. I believe that this link warrants further study to uncover the true mechanism behind it, as I believe there may be more to be uncovered here. Additionally, through my

research, I have shown a plausible link between depersonalisation and exile. I believe that a study of Cicero, a well-known exile whose life is well-documented through epistolary writing, might prove fruitful in this regard.

The concept of personification and depersonalisation being used as coping mechanisms against trauma caused by isolation also provides a fruitful avenue for study from both an ancient and modern perspective. This is so because I believe the concept can be applied to all humans, regardless of the time period, since the experience of the emotions caused by this trauma, and the need to assuage these emotions, are universals of the lived human experience.

Moreover, through my reading of Ovid's exilic texts, I noticed another trend that I have not seen discussed elsewhere. To a far greater degree than he ever fully personifies non-humans, Ovid semi-personifies them, providing something that cannot be considered to have been granted fully human characteristics or sentience. Regardless of this lower level of life afforded to them, they are still given some of the attributes of life, bringing them up by one level or so. If life and sentience are viewed as being on a spectrum with non-humans at one end, humans on the other, and my identified characters somewhere in the middle, these semi-personifications would fall somewhere between non-human and personified characters. I believe that there might be something of psychological importance here.

While I have focused specifically on the major characters Ovid created, the particular roles these characters played for him within this study, just the application of these techniques, within this context of isolation-based trauma, speaks to the mental state of the person who is using them and does not necessarily need to be viewed from a character-based perspective. Every instance is important in its own right as an indicator of mental decline and the lengths to which an individual will go to alleviate the symptoms of this decline. This research has the potential to open avenues of study which will help in the understanding of exiles and their writing in both the ancient and modern worlds.

Bibliography

Abrams, M. H. & Harpham, G. G. (2015) *A Glossary of Literary Terms* 11th ed. Boston: Cengage Learning.

Agrawal, S., Bajpal, N. & Khandelwal, U. (2020) "Recapitulation of Brand Anthropomorphism: An Innovating Marketing Strategy". *The Marketing Review*, 20(1-2), 143-56.

Ahl, F. (1985) *Metaformations: Soundplay and Wordplay in Ovid and Other Classical Poets*. Ithaca & London: Cornell University Press.

American Psychiatric Association (2013) *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders: DSM-5*. 5th ed. Arlington: American Psychiatric Association.

Argetsinger, K. (1992) Dies natales: *Self, Patron, and city in Roman Religion*. PhD Diss., Princeton University.

Arienti, G., Cruciani, M. & Plebe, A. (2019) "Editorial: The Cognitive Underpinnings of Anthropomorphism". *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10(1539), 5-6.

Atherton, G. & Cross, L. (2018) 'Seeing More Than Human: Autism and Anthropomorphic Theory of Mind' *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9(528), 1-18.

Ausonius (1921) *Paulinus Pellaeus Eucharistus Volume II, Books 18-20.* Translated by H. G. Evelyn-White. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Baldick, C. (ed.) (2015) s.v. "Apostrophe" in *The Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms* 4th ed. [Online] Oxford: Oxford University Press. Available at: https://www-oxfordreference-com.uplib.idm.oclc.org/display/10.1093/acref/9780198715443.001.0001/acref-9780198715443-e-85?rskey=mvMGU2&result=2 (Accessed 21 March 2023).

Baldick, C. (ed.) (2015) s.v. "Pathetic Fallacy" in *The Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms* 4th ed. [Online] Oxford: Oxford University Press. Available at: https://www-oxfordreference-com.uplib.idm.oclc.org/display/10.1093/acref/9780198715443.001.0001/acref-9780198715443 (Accessed 21 March 2023).

Baldick, C. (ed.) (2015) s.v. "Personification" in *The Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms* 4th ed. [Online] Oxford: Oxford University Press. Available at: https://www-oxfordreference-com.uplib.idm.oclc.org/display/10.1093/acref/9780198715443.001.0001/acref-9780198715443-e-867?rskey=1cvmJb&result=9 (Accessed 21 March 2023).

Barchiesi, A. (1997) *The Poet and the Prince: Ovid and Augustan Discourse*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Batty, R. M. (1994) "On Getic and Sarmatian Shores: Ovid's Account of the Danube Lands". *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*, 43(1), 88-111.

Behrendt, R. (2012) *The Evolved Structure of Human Social Behaviour and Personality: Psychoanalytic Insights*. London: Karnac Books.

Berstein, N. W. (2011) "*Locus Amoenus* and *Locus Horridus* in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*". *Wenshan Review of Literature and Culture*, 5(1), 67-98.

Besslich, S. (1973) "Die 'Hörner' des Buches: zur Bedeutung von cornua im antiken Buchwese". *Gutenberg-Jahrbuch,* 48(1973), 44-50.

Birch, D. & Hooper, K. (eds.) (2013) "Apostrophe" in *The Concise Oxford Companion to English Literature* 4th ed. [Online] Oxford: Oxford University Press. Available at: https://www-oxfordreference-com.uplib.idm.oclc.org/display/10.1093/acref/9780199608218.001.0001/acref-9780199608218-e-300?rskey=mvMGU2&result=4 (Accessed 21 March 2023).

Birch, D. & Hooper, K. (eds.) (2013) "Pathetic Fallacy" in *The Concise Oxford Companion to English Literature* 4th ed. [Online] Oxford: Oxford University Press. Available at: https://www-oxfordreference-com.uplib.idm.oclc.org/display/10.1093/acref/9780199608218.001.0001/acref-9780199608218-e-5794?rskey=EwN4VB&result=2 (Accessed 21 March 2023).

Birch, D. (ed.) (2009) "Apostrophe" in *The Oxford Companion to English Literature* 7th ed. [Online] Oxford: Oxford University Press. Available at: https://www-oxfordreference-com.uplib.idm.oclc.org/display/10.1093/acref/9780192806871.001.0001/acref-9780192806871-e-300?rskey=mvMGU2&result=5 (Accessed 21 March 2023).

Birch, D. (ed.) (2009) "Personification" in *The Oxford Companion to English Literature* 7th ed. [Online] Oxford: Oxford University Press. Available at: https://www-oxfordreference-com.uplib.idm.oclc.org/display/10.1093/acref/9780192806871.001.0001/acref-9780192806871-e-300?rskey=mvMGU2&result=5 (Accessed 21 March 2023).

Boissier, G. (1885) *L'opposition Sous Les Césars.* Paris: Librairie Hachette et Cie.

Bonaparte, M. (1949) *Life and Works of Edgar Allan Poe*. London: Imago (tr. from *Edgar Poe: Étude psychanalytique*, Paris: 1933).

Bratman, G. K., Anderson, C. B., Berman, M. G., Cochran, B., de Vries, S., Flanders, J., Folke, C., Frumkin, H., Gross, J. J., Hartig, T., Kahn Jr., P. H., Kuo, M., Lawler, J. J., Levin, P. S., Lindahl, T., Meyer-Lindenberg, A., Mitchell, R., Ouyang, Z., Roe, J., Scarlett, L., Smith, J. R., van den Bosch, M., Wheeler, B. W., White, M. P., Zheng, H. & Daily, G. C. (2019) "Nature and Mental Health: An Ecosystem Service Perspective". *Science Advances*, 5(7), DOI: 10.1126/sciadv.aax0903 (https://www.science.org/doi/10.1126/sciadv.aax0903).

Brooks, O. (1963) *Virgil: A Study in Civilized Poetry*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Brunelle, C. (2001) Review of *Displaced Persons: The Literature of Exile from Cicero to Boethius* by J. Claassen. *Carmina Philosophiae*, 10, 83-7.

Bullinger, E. W. (1898) *Figures of Speech Used in the Bible: Explained and Illustrated*. London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, and New York: E. & J. B. Young & Co.

Cairns, F. (1989) *Virgil's Augustan Epic*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.

Capaldi, C. A., Passmore, H-A., Nisbet, E. K., Zelenski, J. M. & Dopko, R. L. (2015) "Flourishing in Nature: A Review of the Benefits of Connecting with Nature and its Application as a Wellbeing Intervention". *International Journal of Wellbeing*, 5(4), 1-16.

Caston, R. R. (2006) "Love as Illness: Poets and Philosophers on Romantic Love". *The Classical Journal*, 101(3), 271-98.

Cattell, J. P. (1966) "Depersonalisation Phenomena". In: S. Arieti (ed.) *American Handbook of Psychiatry*, Vol 3., New York: Basic Books.

Catullus (2002) *The Complete Poetry of Catullus*. Translated by D. Mulroy. Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press.

Claassen, J. (1974) "Publius Ovidius Naso: His Life and Works". *Akroterion*, 19(1/2), 3-16.

Claassen, J. (1986a) "International Interest in Ovid's Exile and the Search for Ovid's Tomb". *Akroterion*, 31(4), 112-7.

Claassen, J. (1986b) *Poeta, Exsul, Vates: A Stylistic and Literary Analysis of Ovid's* Tristia *and* Epistolae ex Ponto. D. Litt diss., Stellenbosch: University of Stellenbosch.

Claassen, J. (1987) "Error and the Imperial Household: An Angry God and the Exiled Ovid's Fate". *Acta Classica*, 22(30), 31-47.

Claassen, J. (1988) "Ovid's Poems from Exile: The Creation of a Myth and the Triumph of Poetry". *Antike und Abendland*, 34, 158-69.

Claassen, J. (1989a) "Carmen and Poetics: Poetry as Enemy and Friend". *Collection Latomus: Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History*, 5, 252-66.

Claassen, J. (1989b) "Meter and Emotion in Ovid's Exilic Poetry". *Classical World*, 82(5), 351-65.

Claassen, J. (1990) "Ovid's Wavering Identity: Personification and Depersonalisation in the Exilic Poems". *Latomus*, 49(1), 102-116.

Claassen, J. (1991a) "The *Consolatio Philosophiae* of Boethius: Pagan Tradition and Christian Innovation". *UNISA Medieval Studies*, 4, 177-95.

Claassen, J. (1991b) "*Une Analyse Stylistique et Littéraire d'Ovide Epistolae ex Ponto* 3.3 *Praeceptor amoris ou Praeceptor Amoris?*". *Les Etudes Classiques*, 59, 27-41.

Claassen, J. (1992) "Structure, Chronology, Tone and Undertone: An Examination of Tonal Variation in Ovid's Exilic Poetry". *Akroterion*, 37(3&4), 98-113.

Claassen, J. (1994) "Ovid's exile: Is the Secret out yet?". Review of Le Secret du Voltigeur d'Amour, by R. Verdiere. *Scholia: Studies in Classical Antiquity*, 3(1), 107-11.

Claassen, J. (1996a) "Dio's Cicero and the Consolatory Tradition". *Proceedings of the Leeds International Latin Seminar*, 8, 29-45.

Claassen, J. (1996b) "Exile, Death and Immortality: Voices from the Grave". *Latomus*, 55(3), 577-90.

Claassen, J. (1999) *Displaced Persons: The Literature of Exile from Cicero to Boethius*. London: Duckworth.

Claassen, J. (1999a) "*Exsul Ludens*: Punning and Word Play in Ovid's Exilic Poetry". *Classical Bulletin*, 75(1), 23-35.

Claassen, J. (1999b) "The Vocabulary of Exile in Ovid's *Tristia* and *Epistolae ex Ponto*". *Glotta*, 75(3-4), 134-71.

Claassen, J. (2000) "*Ad Nostra Tempora: Carmen Perpetuum, Carmen Aeternum*". Review of *Ovidian Transformations: Essays on Ovid's Metamorphoses and its Reception*, by Philip Hardie et al. (eds). *Scholia Reviews*, 9, 24.

Claassen, J. (2001) "The Singular Myth: Ovid's use of Mythology in the Exilic Poetry". *Hermathena*, 170, 11-64.

Claassen, J. (2003a) Review of Amicitia e Potere Nelle Lettere di Cicerone e Nelle Elegie Ovidiane dall'esilio, by Sandra Citroni Marchetti. *Latomus*, 62, 962-3.

Claassen, J. (2003b) "'Living in a Place Called Exile': The Universals of the Alienation Caused by Isolation". *Liberator*, 24, 85-112.

Claassen, J. (2004a) "*Mutatis Mutandis*: The Poetry and Poetics of Isolation in Ovid and Breytenbach". *Scholia*, 13, 71-107.

Claassen, J. (2004b) Review of *Ovid and the Monuments: A Poet's Rome*, by A. J. Boyle. *Scholia Reviews*, 13, 26.

Claassen, J. (2006) Review of La Métamorphose Poétique Chez Ovide: Tristes et Pontiques, by É. Tola. *The Classical Review*, 56(1), 117.

Claassen, J. (2007) Review of *Ovid* Epistolae ex Ponto *Book 1*, by J. F. Gaertner. *Gnomon*, 79, 124-8.

Claassen, J. (2008) *Ovid Revisited: The Poet in Exile*. London: Bloomsbury.

Claassen, J. (2016) "Seizing the *Zeitgeist*: Ovid in Exile and Augustan Political Discourse". *Acta Classica*, 59(1), 52-79.

Claassen, J. (2017) "The Exiled Ovid's Reception of Gallus". *The Classical Journal*, 112(3), 318-41.

Colman, A. M. (ed.) (2015) s.v. "Pathetic Fallacy" in *A Dictionary of Psychology* 4th ed. [Online] Oxford: Oxford University Press. Available at: https://www-oxfordreference-com.uplib.idm.oclc.org/display/10.1093/acref/9780199657681.001.0001/acref-9780199657681-e-6103?rskey=EwN4VB&result=6 (Accessed 21 March 2023).

Colman, A. M. (ed.) (2015) s.v. "Personification" in *A Dictionary of Psychology* 4th ed. [Online] Oxford: Oxford University Press. Available at: https://www-oxfordreference-com.uplib.idm.oclc.org/display/10.1093/acref/9780199657681.001.0001/acref-9780199657681-e-6103?rskey=EwN4VB&result=6 (Accessed 21 March 2023).

Coons, C. & Weber, M. (eds.) (2014) *Manipulation: Theory and Practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cramer, P. (1998) "Coping and Denfense Mechanisms: What's the Difference?" *Journal of Personality*, 66(6), 919-46.

Cramer, P. (2000) "Defense Mechanisms in Psychology Today: Further Processes for Adaptation". *American Psychologist*, 55(6), 637-46.

Crews, F. (1966) *The Sins of the Fathers: Hawthorne's Psychological Themes*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Crowell, C. R. (2019) "Anthropomorphism of Robots: Study of Appearance and Agency". *JMIR Hum Factors*, 6(2), *JMIR Publications* [Online] Available at: https://humanfactors.jmir.org/2019/2/e12629/ (Accessed: 28 July 2023).

Damiano, L. & Dumouchel, P. (2018) 'Anthropomorphism in Human-Robot Co-evolution' *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9(468), 1-9.

Davis, P. (1999) "Instructing the Emperor: Ovid, *Tristia* 2". *Latomus*, 58(4), 799-809.

Davisson, M. H. T. (1984) "Parents and Children in Ovid's Poems from Exile". *The Classical World*, 78(2), 111-4.

Edmondson, J. (2008) "Public Dress and Social Control in Late Republican and Early Imperial Rome". In: Edmondson, J, & Keith, A. (eds.) *Roman Dress and the Fabrics of Roman Culture*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 21-46.

Epley, N., Waytz, A. & Cacioppo, J. T. (2007) "On Seeing Human: A Three-Factor Theory of Anthropomorphism". *Psychological Review*, 114(4), 864-86.

Erikson, E. H. (1968) *Identity: Youth and Crisis*. New York: Norton.

Evans, H. B. (1975) "Winter and Warfare in Ovid's Tomis: (*Tristia* 3.10)". *The Classical Journal*, 70(3), 1-9.

Evans, H. B. (1983) Publica Carmina: *Ovid's books from Exile*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Fairweather, J. (1987) "Ovid's Autobiographical Poem, *Tristia* 4.10". *The Classical Quarterly*, 37(1), 181-96.

Fantham, E. (2004) *Ovid's* Metamorphoses. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fava, M. (2004) "Daytime Sleepiness and Insomnia as Correlates of Depression". *The Journal of Clinical Psychiatry*, 65(16), 27-32.

Feeney, D. (1991) *The Gods in Epic*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Fishwick, D. (1987) *The Imperial Cult in the Latin West: Studied in the Ruler Cult of the Western Provinces of the Roman Empire*. Vol 1. Leiden & Boston: Brill.

Fishwick, D. (1991) *The Imperial Cult in the Latin West: Studies in the Ruler Cult of the Western Provinces of the Roman Empire*. Vol 2.1. Leiden & New York: Brill.

Fitton Brown, A. D. (1985) "The Unreality of Ovid's Tomitan Exile". *Liverpool Classical Monthly*, 10, 18-22.

Fontaine, M. (2019) "The Myth of Ovid's Exile". *Electryone*, 6(1), 1-14.

Fraenkel, E. (1957) *Horace*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Francis, M. (2023) *Depersonalisation and Creative Writing: Unreal City*. Abington & New York: Routledge.

Fränkel, H. (1945) *Ovid: A Poet Between Two Worlds*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Fredericks, B. R. (1974) "*Tristia* 4.10: Poet's Autobiography and Poetic Autobiography". *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 106(1), 139-54.

Freud, S. [1899] (1900) *The Interpretation of Dreams*. New York: MacMillan.

Fulkerson, L. (2023) "Ovidian Pathology, in Love and in Exile". In: Farrell, J., Miller, J. F., Nelis, D. P. & Schiesaro, A. (eds.) *Ovid, Death and Transfiguration*. Leiden & Boston: Brill.

Galasso, L. (2023) "Fantasies of Death in Ovid's Poetry of Exile". In: Farrell, J., Miller, J. F., Nelis, D. P. & Schiesaro A. (eds.) *Ovid, Death and Transfiguration*. Leiden & Boston: Brill.

Galinsky, K. (1996) *Augustan Culture: An Interpretative Introduction*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Gentilcore, R. (1995) 'Landscape of Desire: The Tale of Pomona and Vertumnus in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*' *Phoenix*, 49(2), 110-20.

Geyssen, J. (2007) "Ovid's Addresses to the Book in *Tristia* 1.1". *Latomus*, 66(2), 374-83.

Gibson, B. (1999) "Ovid on Reading: Reading Ovid. Reception in Ovid *Tristia* II". *The Society for the Promotion of Latin Studies*, 89, 19-37.

Gladhill, B. (2013) "The *Domus* of Fama and Republican Space in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*". In: Farrell, J. & Nelis, D. (eds.) *Augustan Poetry and the Roman Republic*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 297-318.

Glare, P. G. W. (2012) *Oxford Latin Dictionary* 2nd ed. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.

Gradel, I. (2002) *Emperor Worship and Roman Religion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Grasmück, E. L. (1978) Exilium: Untersuchungen zur Verbannung in der Antike. Paderborn: Verlag Ferdinand Schöningh.

Grebe, S. (2010) "Why Did Ovid Associate his Exile with a Living Death?". *The Classical World*, 103(4). Pp. 491-509.

Guerrier, Y. (2004) "Arachne and Minerva: Women, Power, and Realization". In: Gabriel, Y. (ed.) *Myths, Stories and Organizations: Premodern Narratives for Our Times*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 151-64.

Handel, A. (1987) *Self and Identity: Perspectives Across the Lifespan*. London & New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Hardie, P. (1986) *Vergil's* Aeneid*: Cosmos *and* Imperium. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Hardie, P. (1999) "Metamorphosis, Metaphor, and Allegory in Latin Epic". In: Beissinger, M., Tylus, J. & Wofford, S. (eds) *Epic Traditions in the Contemporary World: The Poetics of Community*. Berkeley: Oxford, 89-107.

Hardie, P. (2009) "The Word Personified: Fame and Envy in Virgil, Ovid, Spenser". *Materiali e discussion per l'analisi dei testi classici*, 61, 101-15.

Hartman, J. J. (1904-1905) "*De Ovidio Poeta Commentatio*". *Mnemosyne*, 32, 371-419 and *Mnemosyne*, 33, 99-124; 189-218; 333-78.

Hartman, J. J. (1912) "*Onze Wardeering der Latjinsche Elegische Poëzie*". *Verslagen en Mededeelingen der Koninklijke Akademie Wetenschappen Afdeeling Letterkunde*, 11(4), 112-40.

Hasenfratz, H. -P. (1982) *Die Toten Lebenden: Eine Religionsphänomenologische Studie zum Sozialen Tod in Archaischen Gesellschaften*. Leiden: Brill

Hejduk, J. D. (2012) "Arachne's Attitude: *Metamorphoses* 6.25". *Mnemosyne*, 65(4-5), 764-8.

Hendren, T. G. (2013) *Ovid, Augustus and the Exilic Journey in the* Tristia *and* Epistulae ex Ponto. PhD Thesis. University of Florida.

Hilgard, E. R. (1949) "Human Motives and the Concept of the Self". *American Psychologist*, 4, 374-82.

Hinds, S. (1985) "Booking the Return Trip: Ovid and *Tristia* 1". *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society*, 31(211), 13-32.

Hinds, S. (2002) "Landscape with Figures: Aesthetics of Place in the *Metamorphoses* and its Tradition". In: P. R. Hardie (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 122-49.

Hofman, H. (1987) "The Unreality of Ovid's Exile Once Again". *Liverpool Classical Monthly*, 12, p. 23.

Horace (1926) *Satires, Epistles, The Art of Poetry*. Translated by H. R. Fairclough. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Horace (2003) *Horace: The Odes*. Translated by A. S. Kline. [Online] Available at: https://www.poetryintranslation.com/PITBR/Latin/HoraceOdesBkIV.php (Accessed 21 September 2023).

Hornblower, S., Spawforth, A. & Eidinow, E. (eds.) (2012) *Oxford Classical Dictionary* 4th ed. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.

Ingleheart, J. (2015) "*Exegi Monumentum*: Exile, Death, Immortality, and Monumentality in Ovid, *Tristia* 3.3". *The Classical Quarterly*, 65(1), 286-300.

Jacobson, E. (1959) "Depersonalisation". *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, 7, 581-610.

Jakobson, R. & Halle, M. (1971 [2002]) *Fundamentals of Language*. 2nd ed. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Jones, A. H. M. (1963) "The Greeks under the Roman Empire". *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 17, 3-19.

Jones, A. H. M. (1964) *The Later Roman Empire 284-602: A Social, Economic and Administrative Survey Vol. 1*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Kaizer, T. (2013) "Identifying the Divine in the Roman Near East". In: Bricault, L. & Bonnet, C. (eds) *Panthée: Religious Transformations in the Graeco-Roman Empire*. Boston: Brill, 113-28.

Kelly, P. (2014) "Voices Within Ovid's House of Fama". *Mnemosyne*, 67(1), 65-92.

Kenney, E. J. (1982) "Ovid". In Kenney, E. J. (ed.) *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature*. Vol 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 420-57.

Koike, M. & Loughnan, S. (2021) "Virtual Relationships: Anthropomorphism in the digital Age". *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 15(6), *Wiley* [Online] Available at: https://compass.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/spc3.12603 (Accessed: 28 July 2023).

Laughlin, H. P. ([1916]1970) *The Ego and its Defenses*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Lawrence, D. H. (1962) *The Symbolic Meaning: The Uncollected Versions of Studied in Classical American Literature* ed. Armin, Arnold, Anrudel: The Centaur Press.

Lawrence, D. H. (1977) *Studies in Classical American Literature*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Leach, E. W. (1974) "Ekphrasis and the Theme of Artistic Failure in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*". *Ramus*, 3(2), 102-42.

Lee, K. E., Williams, K. J. H., Sargent, L. D., Williams, N. S. G., & Johnson, K. A. (2015) "40-Second Green Roof Views Sustain Attention: The Role of Micro-Breaks in Attention Restoration". *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 42, 182-9.

Lind, L. R. (1972) "Concept, Action, and Character: The Reasons for Rome's Greatness". *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, 103, 235-283.

Liu, R. T., Bettis, A. H. & Burke, T. A. (2020) "Characterizing the Phenomenology of Passive Suicidal Ideation: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of its Prevalence, Psychiatric Comorbidity, Correlates, and Comparisons with Active Suicidal Ideation". *Psychological Medicine*, 50, 367-83.

Longeway, J. L. (1990) "The Rationality of Escapism and Self-Deception". *Behaviour and Philosophy*, 18(2), 1-20.

Lowe, D. M. (2008) "Personification Allegory in the 'Aeneid' and Ovid's 'Metamorphoses'" *Mnemosyne*, 61(3), 414-35

Lumer, C. (2019) "Unconscious Motives and Actions - Agency, Freedom and Responsibility". *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9, *Frontiers in Psychology* [Online] Available at: https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.02777 (Accessed 31 May 2021).

May, J. M. (1995) "Patron and Client, Father and Son in Cicero's *Pro Caelio*". *The Classical Journal*, 90(4), 433-41.

Mayoral, J. A. & Ballesteros, A. (trans) (2006) "Apostrophe" in Sloane, T. O. (ed.) *Encyclopedia of Rhetoric*. [Online] Oxford: Oxford University Press. Available from: https://www-oxfordreference-

com.uplib.idm.oclc.org/display/10.1093/acref/9780195125955.001.0001/acref-9780195125955-e-20?rskey=Xn5v2F&result=8 (Accessed: 21 March 2023).

McArthur, T., Lam-McArthur, J. & Fontaine, L. (eds.) (2018) "Personification" in *The Oxford Companion to the English Language* 2nd ed. [Online] Oxford: Oxford University Press. Available at: https://www-oxfordreference-com.uplib.idm.oclc.org/display/10.1093/acref/9780199661282.001.0001/acref-9780199661282-e-929?rskey=7L7Ndr&result=10 (Accessed 21 March 2023).

McGowan, M. M. (2009) *Ovid in Exile: Power and Poetic Redress in the* Tristia *and* Epistulae ex Ponto. Leiden & Boston: Brill.

Michalopolous, A. N. (2017) "Mythological Time and Space in Ovid's Exile Poetry". In: Bierl, A., Christopolous, M. & Papachrysostomou, A. (eds) *Time and Space in Ancient Myth, Religion and Culture*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 253-65.

Miller, P. A. (2004) *Subjecting Verses: Latin Love Elegy and the Emergence of the Real*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Momigliano, A. (1984) "The Theological Efforts of the Roman Upper Classes in the First Century BC". *Classical Philology*, 79(3), 199-211.

Mordine, M. J. (2010) "*Sine me, liber, ibis*: The Poet, the Book and the Reader in *Tristia* 1.1". *The Classical Quarterly*, 60(2), 524-44.

Mouritsen, H. (2011) *The Freedman in the Roman World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Murray, J. (1928) *The Oxford English Dictionary* 1st ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Murray, P. & Fantham, E. (2010) "Muses". In: Gagarin M. (ed.) *The Oxford Encyclopaedia of Ancient Greece and Rome*: Oxford University Press. Retrieved 29 Mar. 2023 from https://www-oxfordreference-com.uplib.idm.oclc.org/view/10.1093/acref/9780195170726.001.0001/acref-9780195170726-e-838.

Nagle, B. R. (1980) *The Poetics of Exile: Program and Polemic in the* Tristia *and* Epistulae ex Ponto *of Ovid*. Bruxelles: Latomus.

Newlands, C. E. (1997) 'The Role of the Book in *Tristia* 3.1' *Ramus*, 26(1), 57-79.

Nock, M. K., Borges, G., Bromet, E., J., Cha, C. B., Kessler, R. C. & Lee, S. (2008) "Suicide and Suicidal Behaviour". *Epidemiologic Reviews*, 30(1), 133-54.

Norwood, F. (1963) "The Riddle of Ovid's *Relegatio*". *Classical Philology*, 58(3), 150-63.

Noyes, R. & Kletti, R. (1977) "Depersonalisation in Response to Life-Threatening Danger". *Comprehensive Psychiatry*, 18(4), 375-84.

Ovid ([1924]1988) *Ovid: Tristia, Ex Ponto*. 2nd ed. Translated by A. L. Wheeler. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Ovid (2003) *Ovid: The Poems of Exile (*Tristia, Ex Ponto, Ibis*)* Translated by A. S. Kline. [Online] Available at: https://www.poetryintranslation.com/PITBR/Latin/Ovidexilehome.php (Accessed 02 November 2022).

Ovid (2005) *Ovid: The Poems of Exile*. Translated by P. Green. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Park, A. (2009) "Two Types of Ovidian Personification". *Classical Journal*, 104(3), 225-40.

Perotta, G. (2020) "Human Mechanisms of Psychological Defense: Definitions, Historical and Psychodynamic Contexts, Classifications and Clinical Profiles". *International Journal of Neurorehabilitation,* 7(1), 1-7.

Philbrook, R. (2016) "Utopian Rome in Ovid's Externalised View from Exile". *The Classical Outlook*, 91(2), 42-5.

Pindar (1990) *Pythian Odes*. Translated by D. Arnson Svarlien. [Online] Available at http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0162%3Abook%3DN.%3Apoem%3D5 (Accessed 21 September 2023).

Pliny (1855-7) *The Natural History of Pliny*. Translated by J. Bostock & H. T. Riley. London: H. G. Bohn.

Powell, B. B. (2015) *Classical Myth*. 8th ed. Boston: Pearson.

Propertius (2004 [1960]) *The Complete Elegies of Sextus Propertius*. Translated by V. Katz. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Rawson, B. (2003) *Children and Childhood in Roman Italy.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Reed, G. (1972) *The Psychology of Anomalous Experience: A Cognitive Approach*. London: Hutchinson University Press.

Reitz, C. (2013) "Describing the Invisible: Ovid's Rome". *Hermes*, 141(3), 283-93.

Richlin, A. (2011) "Old Boys: Teacher-Student Bonding in Roman Oratory". *The Classical World*, 105(1), 91-107.

Richmond, J. (1995) "The Latter Days of a Love Poet Ovid in Exile". *Classics Ireland*, 2, 97-120.

Rosati, G. (2002) "Muse and Power in the Poetry of Statius". In: Spentzou, E. & Fowler, D. (eds) *Cultivating the Muse: Struggles for Power and Inspiration in Classical Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Roth, M. (2006) "Depersonalisation" in Gregory, R. L. (ed.) *The Oxford Companion to the Mind*. 2nd ed. [Online] Oxford: Oxford University Press. Available from: https://www-oxfordreference-com.uplib.idm.oclc.org/display/10.1093/acref/9780198662242.001.0001/acref-9780198662242-e-245?rskey=kHv7GW&result=2 (Accessed 21 March 2023).

Ruskin, J. (1856) *Modern Painters Vol III*. London: Smith, Elder & Co.

Schertz, K. E. & Berman, M. G. (2019) "Understanding Nature and its Cognitive Benefits" *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 28(5), *Sage Journals* [Online] Available at: https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0963721419854100 (Accessed 26 March 2023).

Schilder, P. (1953) *Medical Psychology*. New York: International Universities Press, Inc.

Schmitz, T. A. (2007) *Modern Literary Theory and Ancient Texts: An Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Scott, K. (1930) "Emperor Worship in Ovid". *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, 61, 43-69.

Segal, C. P. (1969) *Landscapes in Ovid's* Metamorphoses*: A Study in the Transformations of a Literary Symbol*. Wiesbaden: Hermes.

Segal, C. P. (1971) "Ovid's *Metamorphoses*: Greek Myth in Augustan Rome". *Studies in Philology*, 68(4), 371-94.

Segal, C. P. (1998) "Ovid's Metamorphic Bodies: Art, Gender, and Violence in the *Metamorphoses*". *Arion: A Journal of Humanities and the Classics*, 5(3), 9-41.

Shiaele, M. (2010) "Ovid's *Invidia* and the Literary Tradition". *Rosetta*, 8(5), 127-38.

Sierra, M. (2010) "Depersonalisation" in Bayne, T. Cleermans, A., & Wilken, P. (eds.) *The Oxford Companion to Consciousness*. [Online] Oxford: Oxford University Press. Available from: https://www-oxfordreference-com.uplib.idm.oclc.org/display/10.1093/acref/9780198569510.001.0001/acref-9780198569510-e-99?rskey=kHv7GW&result=1 (Accessed 21 March 2023).

Sierra, M., Baker, D., Medford, N., & David, A. S. (2005) "Unpacking the Depersonalisation Syndrome: An Exploratory Factor Analysis on the Cambridge Depersonalisation Scale". *Psychological Medicine*, 35, 1523-32.

Simpson, J. & Weiner, E. (1989) *The Oxford English Dictionary* 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Statius (1908) *The* Silvae *of Statius*. Translated by D. A. Slater. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Stevens, B. (2009) "*Per gestum res est significanda mihi*: Ovid and Language in Exile". *Classical Philology*, 104(2), 162-83.

Syme, R. (1939) *The Roman Revolution*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Taback, N. (2002) *Untangling the Muses: A Comprehensive Study of Sculptures of Muses in the Greek and Roman World*, PhD dissertation, Harvard University.

Taylor, L. R. (1920) "The Worship of Augustus in Italy During his Lifetime". *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, 51, 116-33.

Taylor, L. R. (1931) *The Divinity of the Roman Emperor*. Connecticut: The American Philological Association.

Taylor, L., Hahs, A. K. & Hochuli, D. F. (2017) "Wellbeing and Urban Living: Nurtured by Nature". *Urban Ecosystems*, 21(1), 197-208.

Tibullus (2012) *The Complete Poems of Tibullus: An* En Face *Bilingual Edition*. Translated by R. G. Dennis & C. J. Putnam. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Tissol, G. (2002) "The House of Fame: Roman History and Augustan Politics in *Metamorphoses*". In: Boyd, B. W. (ed.) *Brill's Companion to Ovid*. Leiden & Boston: Bril, 305-35.

Turcan, R. (2001) *The Gods of Ancient Rome: Religion in Everyday Life from Archaic to Imperial Times*. New York: Routledge.

Tyrikian, E. A. (1968) "The Existential Self and the Person". In: C. Gordon & K. J. Gergen (eds) *The Self in Social Interaction*, Vol. 1, New York: Wiley.

Vaillant, G. E. (1977) *Adaptation to Life*. Boston: Little, Brown.

Vaillant, G. E. (1992) *Ego Mechanisms of Defense: A Guide for Clinicians and Researchers*. Washington & London: American Psychiatric Press, Inc.

Van der Velden, B. (2019) "J.J. Hartman on Ovid's (Non-)Exile". *Mnemosyne*, 73(2), 336-42.

Van Hedger, S. C., Nusbaum, H. C., Clohisy, L., Jaeggi, S. M., Buschkuehl, M. & Berman, M. G. (2019) "Of Cricket Chirps and Car Horns: The Effect of Nature Sounds on Cognitive Performance". *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 26, 522-30.

Walsh, P. G. (1961) *Livy: His Historical Aims and Methods.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ward, M. M. (1933) *The Association of Augustus with Jupiter*. Bologna: N. Zanichelli.

Watson, A. (1987) *Roman Slave Law*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Weinstock, S. (1971) Divus Julius, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Wheeler, A. L. (trans) ([1924]1988) *Ovid: Tristia, Ex Ponto*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Wiedemann, T. (1975) "The Political Background to Ovid's *Tristia* 2". *The Classical Quarterly*, 25(2), 264-71.

Williams, G. D. (1992) "Representations of the Book-Roll in Latin Poetry: Ovid, *Tristia* 1.1,3-14 and Related Texts". *Mnemosyne*, 45(2), 178-89.

Williams, G. D. (1994) *Banished Voices: Readings in Ovid's Exile Poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Williams, G. D. (1996) *The Curse of Exile: A Study of Ovid's* Ibis. Cambridge: The Cambridge Philological Society.

Williams, G. D. (2009) "The *Metamorphoses*: A Poet's Poem". In: Knox, P. E. (ed.) *A Companion to Ovid*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 154-69.

Woodburn Hyde, W. (1946) *Paganism to Christianity in the Roman Empire*. Philadelphia: Philadelphia University Press.

Wright, E. ([1984] 2005) *Psychoanalytic Criticism*. London & New York: Routledge.

Zeng, H. (2010) *The Semiotics of Exile in Literature*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Ziogas, I. (2013) *Ovid and Hesiod: The Metamorphosis of the Catalogue of Women*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Zumwalt, N. (1977) "*Fama Subversa*: Theme and Structure in Ovid *Metamorphoses* 12". *California Studies in Classical Antiquity*, 10, 209-22.

CERTIFICATE OF LANGUAGE EDITING

I, the undersigned, declare that I have edited the **MA (Ancient Languages and Cultures)** dissertation of **Angela Lengoloi van Rooyen**, titled:

PERSONIFICATION AND DEPERSONALISATION AS UNCONSCIOUS COPING MECHANISMS IN OVID'S EXILIC TEXTS

I have read the dissertation and made suggestions regarding the layout and use of UK English. I have also checked that all the sources listed in the Bibliography were referred to in the dissertation. While I tried to work as carefully as possible, some errors could have been overlooked.

Signed:

Prof (emeritus) P.J. Botha

(Member of the South African Translators' Institute, no. 1000048.)

Date: 22 September 2023