

RHETORICAL TOPOS IN THE OVID'S EPISTLES FROM EXILE: *TRISTIA* - BOOK II

Cristina GELAN¹

¹Lecturer Ph.D. Department of Modern Languages and Literatures and Communication Sciences "Ovidius" University, Constanta, Romania, crisdali@yahoo.com

Abstract: *This paper aims to achieve an analysis of the elegiac discourse that the poet Publius Ovidius Naso performs masterfully in the second book of the Tristia, which he writes during his exile in Tomis. The purpose of this paper is to highlight the position and attitude of the poet on his exile which he was convicted by imperial edict. The analysis that we propose is based on two approaches to research the discourse, namely: discursive resources, on the one hand and discursive practices, on the other. In terms of discursive resources the analysis highlights the interpretative repertoires used by the poet to presenting his defense in relation to his condition, namely exiled by relegatio. An important role in this regard lies with symbolic resources which the poet uses the most. On the other hand, the analysis of discursive practices is based on the way of organization of discourse and on rhetorical of language which the poet uses masterfully and which reveals his rhetorical talent.*

Key words: rhetorical topos, symbolic resources, discursive resources, discursive practices, rhetoric of language.

Introduction

"Tristia" and "Pontic Epistles", also known as the poems of exile, can be considered some of the most impressive autobiographical writings of ancient literature, both in terms of content, form and style. These writings express the situation of the dramatic introspection realizes by the poet Ovid, traumatized by isolation in Tomis, fell out of favor with Rome, feeling alone among strangers from the edge of the empire and ignored in terms of powerlessness rehabilitation. For before exile in Tomis, Ovid was one of the pampered poets of Rome, enjoying a high reputation thanks to his writings.

"Tristia" and "Pontic Epistles" testify about a particular kind of elegy to the poet Ovidius Naso skillfully develops, namely elegy form of a letter, loaded with an important documentary value. Two fundamental features dominate this specific type of elegy: on the one hand the rhetoric discourse of Ovid, from which transpires a special type of speech, speech for defense, addressed to friends or to the emperor in order to induce the latter to recall to Rome, or even to change his place of exile; on the other hand the concern of Ovid for poetry, which is building a special world, a poetical world, that is opposed to that real, from which transpires the cathartic role of poetry, in which he describes a universal psychological state of exile and exiled.

The second book of "Tristia" entitled "Book of the Emperor" is an elegy written in the form of a letter sent from Tomis - the place of his exile - to the Emperor Augustus. The book is written as a single poem high stretch in 578 verses, which Ovidius Naso argues for the purpose of redemption honor that had lost when it was decided his exile by imperial edict.

The book begins with a presentation of the author himself, which transpires agony which he passes. Poet laments the situation is also critic and praise while the two supreme courts are responsible for the fate the muses and Emperor Augustus. The whole poem is an organization of arguments in order to build a convincing pleading for his innocence.

The 578 verses that constitute "Book of the Emperor" is an addressing several topics, some of which are repeated but in another explanatory key. Thus, we find, in the argumentative strategies that poet developed following topics: poetry as a mercy to forgiveness; admission of guilt; exonerate and stressing that not conspired; worship, praise and adulation of the Emperor; comparison of the Emperor with the supreme god Jupiter; eulogy of imperial house; arguing of his innocence and asking to be forgiven; bringing into focus the memories and facts of social life to show off his honorable life; *carmen et error* as reasons for his exile; description the benefit of his name and his social reputation; description form and manner of banishment; description exile and perseverance for a milder exile; his hope that it will be able to convince the emperor and anger they will cease; justification of his work compared to the Greek and Roman work, including the contemporary one; stressing that it is only punished in connection with a theme - love, which describes weather poets in their lyrics; exemplification on certain dangerous approach of the theme of love; bringing to the forefront his works of the second phase of development of his creation, which appeals to mythology and is praising the emperor.

Discursive resources and evaluative practices - interpretative repertoires and symbolic resources

The analysis of discursive resources that they exploit the poet Ovid, in the second book of "Tristia", highlights a number of interpretative repertoires which he uses to support his pleading in the situation they are in. The weapon masterfully wields the poet Ovidius Naso is the speech in its defense. We are talking about a speech understood as a social practice, for the poet seeks, using assessments and descriptions of certain practical consequences of their practical effect. It is an evaluative practice in the sense proposed by Potter, Edwards and Wetherell (1993: 383) in a study that seeks to have that finality for action, namely changing his place of exile by Emperor Augustus.

As a social practice, the discourse is used to doing things: to place blame, to excuse or justify, to present in a favorable light, to persuade etc., all of which are evidence of the action guidelines, an "functional guidelines" (Potter, Wetherell, Gill & Edwards, 1990) of the discourse of Ovid. By justifying its position and criticism of the punishment received, Ovid expresses its attitude in this respect, it is a position. We are talking about the size of an argumentative attitude, as she developed Billing (1987).

The poet uses the variability of own opinions as a resource to analyze actions on of Augustus the hand, and on the other its own shares. His speech, dialectic otherwise, regarding both of the rational and the emotional side. Thus, on the one hand the poet is praising the emperor and brings adulation showed his gratitude for small punishment he received: "whose [Caesar] mercy in punishing me is such / that the outcome's better than I feared / My life was spared, your anger stopped short of death, / O Prince, how sparingly you used your powers!" (Ovid, 1972: 52: 125 - 128), while humbles himself with simulated modestly: "I'm undeservedly blamed. Narrow the furrow I plough: / while that was a great and fertile theme. / A little boat shouldn't trust itself to the waves / because it dares to fool about in a tiny pond. / Perhaps – and I should even question this – I'm fit / for lighter verse, adequate for humble music: / but if you order me to sing of the Giants, beaten / by Jove's lightning, the weight will cripple me if I try. / It is a rich mind can tell of Caesar's mighty deeds, / if the content's not to overpower the work. / Still I was daring: but I thought I detracted from it, / and what was worse, it harmed your authority. / I returned to my light labors, the songs of youth, / stirring my feelings with imaginary desires" (Ovid, 1972: 62: 327 - 340). On the other hand, he warns the emperor that he was wrongfully

punished: "you've never unrolled my witticisms? / Yet if, by chance, as I wish, you'd had the time / you'd have read nothing criminal in my 'Art'. / ... but that doesn't render it contrary to established law, / or destined to teach the daughters of Rome. / ... / I sing *what is lawful*, permissible intrigue, / and there'll be nothing sinful in my song" (Ovid, 1972: 60: 238 - 240; 243 - 244; 249 - 250), and in respect of him recognizes his genius and ranks among the leading poets of his time: "But even if my house is lowly in means and origin, / at least my genius renders it not unknown: /.../ and the cultured crowd know Ovid well, / and dare count him one not to be despised" (Ovid, 1972: 52: 115 - 116; 119 - 120). By calling interpretative repertoires, the poet appeals to the resources of some common social meanings. Thus, love is a leitmotif of the time, and his writings are in the registry with those of his contemporaries. In this context, Ovid concludes that his punishment is illogical: bringing in attention Greek and Roman literature, he finds that love is the eternal topic tapped, and his writings merely magnify and describe this feeling. Therefore, that only he is punished it seems unfair. The fact that the punishment comes several years after the writing of these works, which have been left to the public and were even appreciated by Augustus himself, makes it seem even more illogical and increase the feeling of injustice.

Ovid wears his argumentative strategies of cultural resources they have on hand to provide, maintain and reproduce general and specific representations of his time. Thus, he brings up a whole list of poets, Latin or Greek, to justify that his thematic approaches lies between literary preoccupations of the time. Ovid put together poets whose work was even devoted to representing the subject in his time: Lucretius, Terence, Vergil with *Aeneid*, Homer with *Iliad and Odyssey*, Sophocles with *Electra*, Aristide, and poets like Memiu, Ticide, Anser Cinna, Catone, Cornificiu, Metela, Perila, Varo, Serviu, Hortensiu (Ovid, 1972: 60 - 67; 70). Also, the poet refers to other kinds of writings that would have been based on fears more damaging for those times: "There's 'tragedy' too, involving obscene laughter, / with many exceedingly shameful words:" (Ovid, 1972: 64: 409 - 410) and "Others have written about the art of playing dice - / to our ancestors that was no light sin:" (Ovid, 1972: 68: 471 - 472). We are talking about a social function of language, used as a discursive resources, his speech is used to provide a version of the social and cultural reality.

Supporting the usefulness of his poetry and that it is indispensable, Ovid making use of

the principle of uses, wishes to emphasize that poetry can be both a good instrument and a bad one, therefore the reader should be warned of a potential risk. For example, as the drug can prolong life or kill; plants can be beneficial or not; the fire is useful and dangerous at the same time; the sword may belong to a thief and can be used in an ambush, and eloquence can serve just as causes unfair, harmful, if the reader should be warned not to that end, and poetry can corrupt: “nothing’s useful, that can’t also wound / What’s more useful than fire? Yet whoever sets out / to commit arson, arms his bold hands with fire. / Medicine sometimes grants health, sometimes destroy it, / showing which plants are helpful, which do harm. / The robber and cautious traveler both wear a sword: / one for ambush, the other for defence. / Eloquence is learnt to plead just causes: / it protects the guilty, crushes the innocent” (Ovid, 1972: 60 - 61: 266 - 274). The main argument in its defense brings Ovid is to highlight the difference between art and life. The poet “insists that everything in his books is imagination: it is just art, not evidence; it is about “telling” rather than “doing” ... [and] his writings are not a reflection of his soul” (Gaidig, 2009: 63).

Another category of discursive resources which the poet uses masterfully constitute the symbolic resources, understood as the “registry of terms and metaphors are used to describe and evaluate the actions and events” (Potter & Wetherell, 1987: 138). The poet granted in this respect an important space to symbols, which use the most, and they operate both to build a compelling speech, and closely related to concern for poetry. For the poet argues, it is necessary to distinguish between poetry and life, between the ear pleasure and enjoyment of the senses; and consequently between the artist afford freedoms influenced his Muse, and the man who should remain good Roman citizen (Gaidig, 2009: 64).

By analyzing the symbolic resources of the second book of the “Tristia” we can say that these constitute to the three levels: of the Emperor Augustus, of the poet himself and of love. At the first level, we encounter Jupiter (Jove + Pater; sometimes encountered to the named *Joe*), the supreme god, Zeus in the Greek pantheon, who is associated with the Emperor Augustus. At the second level we meet binomial Ovidius - Acteon, whose symbolism justify one reason, and the least that we can penetrate it with meaning, for which the poet was punished and exiled. And if we talk about the third level, we find here a myriad of mythical characters which the poet brings into focus in order to justify the importance of the sense of

love and exploitation of various forms of embodiment thereof in terms of literary and artistic. In fact, this exculpatory approach represents a discursive strategy created to own defenses.

Augustus is compared with Jupiter, which, really, is capable of the greatest evils which they manifested by thunder him, but also he is able and highest good, manifested this time by purity of his divinity: “but a god’s sometimes known to be appeased: / it’s known for clouds to scatter, the day grow bright. / I’ve seen an elm weighed down with vine leaves, / that’s been struck by savage Jupiter’s lightning”(Ovid, 1972: 53: 141 - 144). Comparisons with Jupiter are multiple, through a series of repetitions poet wants to highlight the similarities between the two, of course as a discursive strategy needed his rhetorical approach: “So it’s right to call him the father and ruler of the gods, / it’s right the wide world owns nothing greater than Jove. / You also, since you’re called father and ruler of the land, / should follow the ways of the god with the same title” (Ovid, 1972: 48: 37 - 40) or “I swear by you, a present and a visible god, / this heart supported you, greatest of men” (Ovid, 1972: 48: 54 - 55) or “Your glory’s not increased by poetry, nor has it / any means of growing to make it greater. / Jove has fame in excess: still he enjoys his deeds / being retold, and for himself to be the theme of verse” (Ovid, 1972: 51: 67 – 70) or “I don’t beg to return, though we believe the great gods / have often granted more than that prayer” (Ovid, 1972: 54: 183 - 184) and “As Jove, who watches over the gods, as well as / the high heavens, hasn’t time to notice lesser things, / so as you gaze round the world that depends on you, / inferior matters escape your care” (Ovid, 1972: 54: 215 - 218).

In relation to the discourse strategies that Ovid uses for the binomial Augustus - Jupiter, Evenou Gaidig (2009: 61 - 62.) noted that it can be concluded that if Augustus was affected by poetry of Ovid this is because it failed in its greatness and to prove a new guarantor, he must be insensitive to the writings of the poet and, therefore, withdraw his conviction. For if the God himself can be persuaded, then Augustus may be, for the emperor it is like the god: “song often influences the great gods” (Ovid, 1972: 47: 22) or “If Jupiter hurled his lightning, every time men sinned, / it wouldn’t be long before he was weapon-less” (Ovid, 1972: 48: 33 - 34) or “but as a god’s won by red blood of a hundred bulls, / so he’s won by the smallest offering of incense” (Ovid, 1972: 51: 75 - 76) or “but a god’s sometimes known to be appeased: /it’s known for clouds to scatter, the day grow bright”(Ovid, 1972: 53: 141 - 142) and “I don’t beg to return,

though we believe the great gods / have often granted more than that prayer" (Ovid, 1972: 54: 183 - 184).

Ovid himself becomes a symbol in his own elegy. Thus he himself is a "character of their own mythologies" (Răchită, 2014: 462) in an environment where "epic poetry and rhetoric are meeting to remove any boundary between reality and fiction" (Răchită, 2014: 462). In this regard, Constantin Răchită wrote: "If he wants to describe a state of exiled or of conditions of exile Ovid turn to the power of representation of the myth: the poetry scene imagined by the poet parade in masks of the gods, of mythological characters or epic heroes fail to suggest easier affects. For example, the injustice of exile, which the poet considers not the lack of motivation, but rather excessive punishment given by the emperor is indicated by the myth of Actaeon (Tristia II, 105 - 106). The myth of Actaeon is centered of the figure of the hunter turned to the goddess Diana into a stag torn own hunting dogs. Acteon's fault is to have seen involuntary goddess naked while bathing. The term that Ovid uses to describe the fault of Acteon is *error* (Met. III, 142), the same it he uses regarding his guilt and unspoken, within which, unlike *crimenorscelus* appoint an act unintentionally committed" (Răchită, 2014: 462 - 463).

About symbolism feeling of love in terms of mythology, Ovidius speaks in 59 verses. Thus, beginning with the verse 361 and ending with 420 of the second book of the "Tristia", the poet brings into focus a variety of mythological symbolic representations of the various faces of love the lyrics sung by great poets. In this regard, the verses of the poet who do succeed symbolic representations is sending a large number of poets - and note that his poem is replete with references to the great representatives of the ancient Greek tragedy-including Greek lyric poet Sappho: "What did Sappho, the Lesbian, teach the girls, but love?" (Ovid, 1972: 63: 365); Menander's theater: "No plot of playful Menander's is free of love" (Ovid, 1972: 63: 369); Homer with *Iliad*: "The *Iliad* itself, what's that but adultery / over whom a husband and a lover fought?" (Ovid, 1972: 63: 371 - 372) and *Odyssey*: "What's the *Odyssey* but Penelope wooed by many suitors / while her husband's away, for the sake of love?" (Ovid, 1972: 63 - 64: 375 - 376); Euripides with *Hipolit*: "What's in the *Hippolytus* but Phaedra's blind passion?" (Ovid, 1972: 64: 383) and *Medea*: "Medea, who dipped her sword in her children's blood, / was roused to do it by the pain of slighted love" (Ovid, 1972: 64: 387 - 388); Sophocles with *Electra*, Aeschylus with *Orestes*: "Who reads

of Electra and maddened Orestes, / reads of Aegisthus's and Clytemnestra's crime" (Ovid, 1972: 64: 395 - 396); Aristide with Miletus damned: "Achilles, belittling brave actions with his verse. / Aristides associated himself with Milesian vice" (Ovid, 1972: 67: 413 - 414).

Through symbols used the poet updates and explains a reality that considers important to build his exculpatory speech of meanings. Thus, the symbol becomes a way of access, awareness and mixing various moods through which he passes.

Discursive practices - the discursive organization of the rhetorical topos and the rhetoric of language

How to organize discursive poet realizes that represents a genuine apologetic strategy. Thus, the second book of "Tristia" constituted as an Augustinian apology. The only instrument for perfecting it, which the poet confesses that having it at hand, is the muse. In this context, the poem becomes the object directly and essentially of the reflection and devotion to the transcendent is constituted as a supreme argument.

The argumentative strategies of Ovid are dialectical. His argumentative speech is the prerogative of a subtle dialectic that the form and presentation of ideas, reveals the rhetorical talent of poet. The paradox finds also place among the arguments used "by constantly oscillates between two paradoxical theses: his innocence and guilt, error and majesty of the emperor Augustus, the desire to be punished and be forgiven at the same time. Ovid refuses to articulate very clearly his view using several detours, and creates a dialectical with himself, the reader discover the rhetorical talent of the poet" (Gaidig, 2009: 57).

The pathetic style, most often exacerbated replete with rhetorical aspects relevant an elegy of which transpires the drama of the situation in which the poet and his burning desire to persuade the emperor to reconsider the punishment that he gave it to him. By arguments which the poet brings in this regard, we are witnessing a particular kind of elegy that emerges by the turmoil and his anxieties to justify that his poems of love, including *Ars amandi* not contradict strict moral principles of the emperor, but continue the tradition of roman elegiac poetry exalting the feeling of love during the Republican developed by other poets, including appoints Sextus Propertius and Albius Tibullus, which, however, attributes and guilt that transpire in the way they live their life, guilt that he does not have, whereas his poetry is only art and just reaches of the artistic level, his lifestyle not expressing anything that might come into contradiction with moral principles imposed by the emperor: "but that doesn't render it contrary to established law, / or

destined to teach the daughters of Rome. / And so you can't doubt whom I wrote it for, / one of the three books has these four lines: "(Ovid, 1972: 60: 243 - 246) or "I sing *what is lawful*, permissible intrigue, / and there'll be nothing sinful in my song" (Ovid, 1972: 60: 249 - 250) and "Tibullus thinks it's hard to believe his girl's denials, / when she swears the same about him, to her husband. / He also admits to teaching her how to cheat her guards, / saying, the wretch, that he's checked by his own arts. / ... / and by what arts a wife can cheat her spouse. / It didn't do him harm, Tibullus is read and pleases, / and he was known when you were first called prince. / You'll find the same maxims in charming Propertius: / yet he's not censured in the slightest way. / I succeeded them, since honesty forbids me / to reveal the names of well-known living men. / I confess I'd no fear that where so many sailed, / one would be wrecked, and all the rest unharmed" (Ovid, 1972: 68: 447 - 470).

Left-handed, Ovid denounce an error that made a king, namely to condemn without first poet to read his work. But that has not had time to read his poems is understood, however, the decision regarding the judgment was hasty: "So, should I wonder if, weighed down by so many things, / you've never unrolled my witticisms? / Yet if by chance, as I wish, you'd had the time / you'd have read nothing criminal in my 'Art'" (Ovid, 1972: 60: 237 - 240) or "so as you gaze round the world that depends on you, / inferior matters escape your care. / Should you, the Empire's prince, leave your post / and read poetry I've set going on limping feet?" (Ovid, 1972: 59: 217 - 220) and "a smaller punishment is due my matter" (Ovid, 1972: 70: 516).

Moreover, by his arguments the poet invokes a distancing from his own feelings, stressing that his poems sing ephemeral or easy love, as he himself calls it when he defines itself *tenerorum lusor amorum* (*joking singer of light love*), and unhappy, unrequited or betrayed love also: "This lewdness made you hate me, for the arts, / you were sure, troubled sacred marriage-beds. / But no bride learned deception from my teaching, / no one can teach what he scarcely knows. / I made sweet pleasurable songs in such a way / that no scandal ever touched my name. / There's no husband even in the lower ranks, / who doubts his paternity through my offence. / Believe me, my character's other than my verse – / my life is modest, my Muse is playful – / and most of my work, deceptive and fictitious, / is more permissive than its author / A book's not evidence of a life but a true impulse / bringing many things to delight the ear" (Ovid, 1972: 63: 345 - 358). Therefore, "Ovid insist on the surface side of his writings ("falso", "leve") and he wants to prove that it is not for his

work to be accused of immorality, since it exists only in his imagination rather than reality; this is because his writing does not describe his own morals, but only subject to purely spiritual inspirations. So if Ovid depreciating his art, to exonerate does in an indirect way and his aroused strong Augustus regret for his punishment, that to be presented as child's play to seem absurd" (Gaidig, 2009: 59).

Ovid justifies his concern for topics like love by arguments invoking the modesty of his genius, "he maintains modesty of his work, whose subject is limited to love, explaining that writing the great achievements of Augustus required a great genius that he does not have it. If so he would have abandoned frivolous topic of love for a nobler theme, surely he would have tarnished the glory of Augustus, compromising his virtues through a sacrilege, because of its incompetence. It is noted here that self-humiliation of Ovid is proportional to flattery that he wants them to do Augustus. And if he demeans, he does it boast a better emperor. All these are nothing but sham modesty" (Gaidig, 2009: 58): "Warring Rome didn't deny me matter, / it's virtuous work to tell one's country's tale. / Lastly, since you've filled the world with deeds, / some part of it all was mine to sing, / as the sun's radiant light attracts the eye / so your exploits should have drawn my spirit. / I'm undeservedly blamed. Narrow the furrow I plough: / while that was a great and fertile theme. / A little boat shouldn't trust itself to the waves / because it dares to fool about in a tiny pond. / Perhaps - and I should even question this - I'm fit / for lighter verse, adequate for humble music: / but if you order me to sing of the Giants, beaten / by Jove's lightning, the weight will cripple me if I try / It's a rich mind can tell of Caesar's mighty deeds, / if the content's not to overpower the work. / Still I was daring: but I thought I detracted from it, / and what was worse, it harmed your authority. / I returned to my light labors, the songs of youth, / stirring my feelings with imaginary desires" (Ovid, 1972: 62: 321 - 340).

Poetry is, for its author, in the special circumstances of exile, "the space that reflects one major reality: to delight (*plurima mulcendis auribus apta ferens* [bringing many things to delight the ear]), it is released from any other obligations, including the author's emotional condition (*nec liber indicium est animi* [A book's not evidence of a life, but a true impulse])" (Franga & Franga, 2009: 37 - 38). Moreover, we are witnessing a poetic dialectic, which combines with a special rhetoric soteriological dimension of poetry: "and the Muse who stirred the anger also calm it: / song often influences the great gods" (Ovid, 1972: 47: 21 - 22), with blaming it: "Were I wise I'd rightly hate the learned Sisters, /

goddesses ruinous to their own devotee"(Ovid, 1972: 47: 13 - 14). Blaming is nothing but condemnation of the poetry by the poet condemned because of it.

The poet uses an extensive advocacy to support the importance of the topic which he expressed in the lyrics poems dedicated of love. In this regard, he brings into focus a number of prominent Romans and Greeks poets, the work of some of them were even dedicated and accounting subject in his time: Lucretius, Terence, Virgil with *Aeneid*, Homer with *Iliad and Odyssey*, Sophocles with *Electra*, Aristide, and poets like Memiu, Ticida, Anser Cinna, Catone, Cornificiu, Metela, Perila, Varo, Serviu, Hortensiu (Ovid, 1972: 60 - 67; 70). The remembrance of these authors is part of discursive weapons, as the poet himself confesses: "I'll not defend myself with so many foreign weapons, / Roman books too have plenty of frivolous matter" (Ovid, 1972: 67: 421 – 422).

Evocation of his past, as biographical - existential discourse is another strategy which the poet uses in his defense in order to rehabilitation in the eyes of Augustus: "Yet, I recall, you approved me, and my ways, / when I paraded before you, on the horse you gave. / ... / Nor was the fate of those on trial wrongly granted / to my care, nor the cases examined by the *centumvirs*. / I also settled private issues, without criticism, as arbiter, / and even the losers admitted my good faith" (Ovid, 1972: 51 - 52: 89 - 96) and "and the cultured crowd know Ovid well, / and dare count him one not to be despised" (Ovid, 1972: 52: 119 - 120). Thus, Ovid describes himself as "knight" ("eques"), honorific term and that he appropriates grace his appurtenance to *Transuectio Equitum*. This knighthood was among the most deserving honor the knights: they remain discreet in society without being too rich or too poor and they do not notice in any manner" (Gaidig, 2009: 60).

In this context the poet sees in the position of tragic hero, for he has not deserved the inexorably fate which is given as prey fate is responsible both for the dirt and for people's happiness against which you can't do anything: "I wish I hadn't. But destiny drew me on, / and my cleverness punished me" (Ovid, 1972: 63: 341 - 342).

However "Ovid's behavior is strangely mixed: for if on the one hand it presents itself as a victim of destiny, on the other hand he admits that deserve their fate. Indeed, he makes his self-criticism and even a very severe manner. It seems to judge his inexcusable crime (unforgivable)" (Gaidig, 2009: 58): "I wish I hadn't. But destiny drew me on" (Ovid, 1972: 63: 341) or "More, the edict, though harsh and threatening, / was still mild when naming my sentence: / since in it I'm called *relegatus* and not exile, / and special words cover my possessions" (Ovid, 1972: 53: 135 -

138) and "Merciful Caesar, I plead these as my precedents: / let my skill soften your anger. / It's justified indeed: I don't deny I deserve it – / shame hasn't completely fled my cheeks –" (Ovid, 1972: 48: 27 - 30) or "Nothing for it but to confess my sin and my / open fault: I'm sorry for my wit and taste" (Ovid, 1972: 62: 315 - 316).

Poet's attitude regarding the guilt would have had and what punishment was imposed is that many of the arguments used in the poem, one paradoxical. Sometimes the poet exculpatory and accuses the emperor because he imposed a punishment which at first sight might be considered mild, although it is not: exile and not death; and exile in the form of the easiest - namely *relegatio*. Complacency and flattery of state poet transpires when reporting on the situation of choice between death and exile: "if only time will mellow Caesar's anger, / whose mercy in punishing me is such / that the emperor's better than I feared. / My life was spared, your anger stopped short of death, / O Prince, how sparingly you used your powers" (Ovid, 1972: 52: 124 - 128).

Some other times the poet brings praise of the Emperor Augustus pointing out his blessings: his clemency regarding vanquished peoples; rewarding his enemies even if they deserve it, thus winning the love of his people; the Emperor's remarkable political skills. Illustrative of this are verses such as: "And you do: no one has ever been able to hold / the reins of power with greater moderation. / You've often granted mercy to a defeated enemy / that he'd not have granted to you if he'd been victor. / I've often seen those you've enriched by wealth / or honors take up weapons against you: / the day that ends the war ends its anger, for you, / and both sides bring their gifts to the temple together: / even as your soldiers rejoice at beating the enemy, / the enemy's a reason to rejoice at his own defeat" (Ovid, 1972: 48: 41 - 50) and "Nor is that peace yours, that you grant the nations, / since you wage many restless wars" (Ovid, 1972: 59 - 60: 235 - 236). He uses excessive complacency towards the Emperor Augustus. Moreover, given the importance of the concept of family that had begun to preach increasingly more Augustus, Ovid brings into question the whole family of the emperor, praising it and this: "may Livia, joined with you, complete her years, / worthy of no other husband but you, / if not for her meant for unmarried life, / there was no other you could have married: / may your son, Tiberius, be safe, with you in safety, / and rule this Empire when old, with one older, / and may Germanicus and Drusus, your grandsons, / glory of youth, emulate you and your father's deeds" (Ovid, 1972: 53 - 54: 161 - 168) and "now

Germany, through Tiberius, feels your vigor, / and a Caesar wages war for a mighty Caesar / Truly there's no weak part in the body of Empire" (Ovid, 1972: 59: 229 - 231).

The text of the second book of the "Tristia" there are also some explanations regarding the guilt that brought the poet in a position to be exiled. Many interpreters of the creation of Ovid have commented on this aspect. They have reached at the same conclusion: as it appears in the text, the blame of Ovid translates to *carmen et error*, that means *the poetry* and *a mistake*. With a particular rhetorical talent, Ovid remember this in several places in his poem: "Take my work away, and you take the accusation / against me away, also: I charge the verse with guilt" (Ovid, 1972: 47: 9 - 10) or "me, a wretch, ruined by my own talent? / Why return to the newly condemned Muses, my reproach?" (Ovid, 1972: 47: 2 - 3) or "Ah me! If I'd not been damaged by recent events" (Ovid, 1972: 52: 97) or "Why did I see anything? Why make my eyes guilty? / Why was a mischief, unwittingly, known to me? / Actaeon, unaware, saw Diana unclothed: / none the less he became his own hounds' prey / Even fate must be atoned for, among the powers that be / to a wounded god chance is no excuse" (Ovid, 1972: 52: 103 - 108) and "Though two charges, *carmen et error*, a poem and an error, / ruined me, I must be silent about the second fault:" (Ovid, 1972: 59: 207 - 208). And if about *carmen* he dares to be talking more, in terms of *error* the poet does not like to give too much detail, considering it undesirable: "I'm not important enough to re-open your wound, Caesar, / it's more than sufficient you should be troubled once" (Ovid, 1972: 59: 209 - 210). In terms of his sentence, it seems to have been given by imperial edict, without prior consultation of the Senate, taking the form of *relegatio*: "You didn't condemn my action by Senate decree, / nor was my banishment ordered by special court. / With stern invective – worthy of a prince – / you yourself, as is right, avenged the offence. / More, the edict, though harsh and threatening, / was still mild when naming my sentence: / since in it I'm called *relegatus* and not exile" (Ovid, 1972: 53: 131 - 137).

An analysis of the discourse on the punishment received more highlights perspectives from which it is regarded by the poet. The eight perspectives will highlight Ovid that are also testimony to the dialectical argumentative strategies, in which he masterfully builds his speech, showing a great rhetorical talent. Thus, the punishment is right "It's justified indeed: I don't deny I deserve it" (Ovid, 1972: 48: 29) and unjust also "but that doesn't render it contrary to established law, / or destined to teach the daughters of Rome" (Ovid, 1972: 60: 243 - 244) or "I sing *what is lawful*,

permissible intrigue, / and there'll be nothing sinful in my song" (Ovid, 1972: 60: 249 - 250) or "So with verse, read with a virtuous mind / it'll be established nothing of mine will harm" (Ovid, 1972: 61: 275 - 276) or "I'm undeservedly blamed. Narrow the furrow I plough:" (Ovid, 1972: 62: 327) or "but a grave punishment has followed my jests" (Ovid, 1972: 69: 494) and "Among so many thousands of our people, / so much writing, I'm the one my Calliope wounds" (Ovid, 1972: 71: 567 - 568); is too big: "and while others have been banished with greater cause, / no one's assigned a remoter place than mine" (Ovid, 1972: 54: 193 - 194) and "If it's right to scribble mimes that copy vice, / a smaller punishment is due my matter" (Ovid, 1972: 69 - 70: 515 - 516), and too small also: "if only time will mellow Caesar's anger, / whose mercy in punishing me is such / that the outcome's better than I feared" (Ovid, 1972: 52: 124 - 126) and "Great hope fills me, gazing at you, most merciful prince, / and fails me when I gaze at what I've done" (Ovid, 1972: 53: 147 - 148); the punishment could be changed in the sense that it could ease the poet's life: "If you granted me a milder, closer place of exile / a large part of my punishment would be eased" (Ovid, 1972: 54: 185 - 186) or "So, a suppliant, I beg you to banish me somewhere safe, / so that peace as well as my home aren't taken from me" (Ovid, 1972: 59: 201 - 202) and "but a safer, more peaceful place of exile, I beg for, / so my punishment might match the offence" (Ovid, 1972: 71: 577 - 578), as could be forgiven: "But unless I've sinned, how can you forgive? / My fate has given you the chance for mercy" (Ovid, 1972: 48: 31 - 32) or "Spare me, father of the country, don't take away / all hope of placating you, forgetful of my name!" (Ovid, 1972: 54: 181 - 182) and "Not that I should return to Italy, unless some day / perhaps you'll be swayed by my long punishment" (Ovid, 1972: 71: 575 - 576); and also is old: "I too, long ago, sinned with that kind of writing: / a fault that's not new earns new punishment: / I'd published those songs when I passed before you, / so many times, a faultless knight, as you reviewed our sins. / So the writing I thought, in my youth, would never hurt me, / scarcely foreseeing it, hurts me now I'm old. / Late vengeance in excess for those early books, / remote the penalty from the time of guilt" (Ovid, 1972: 70: 539 - 546) and the new simultaneously: "I'm not alone in having sung tender love-songs: / but I'm the one punished for singing of love" (Ovid, 1972: 63: 361 - 362) or "In the end I've not seen one of all those many writers / who's been ruined by his Muse – they picked on me" (Ovid, 1972: 69: 495 - 496) and "a fault that's not new earns new punishment" (Ovid, 1972: 70: 540).

If the first part of the book we see that the poet makes use of rhetorical means by which seeks to persuade Augustus or arouse his compassion: "Merciful Caesar, I plead these as my precedents: / let my skill soften your anger" (Ovid, 1972: 48: 27 - 28) or "spare me, I pray, hide your lightning bolt, cruel weapon, / a weapon, ah, too well known to wretched me! / Spare me, father of the country, don't take away / all hope of placating you, forgetful of my name!" (Ovid, 1972: 54: 179 - 182) and "so my fears vanish, change, return, / give, or deny me hope of pleasing you" (Ovid, 1972: 53: 153 - 154), in the second part we notice that the poet is determined to defend their own cause. In this sense, he brings concrete arguments to support his defense that he considers important in terms of reviewing the sentence he received and he calls for a punishment commensurate with his guilt: "So with verse, read with a virtuous mind / it'll be established nothing of mine will harm. / But I 'corrupt some'? Whoever thinks so, errs, / and claims too much for my writings. / Even if I'd confessed it, the games also sow / seeds of iniquity: order the theatres closed! / Many have often found an excuse for sin / when the hard earth's covered with Mars's sand!" (Ovid, 1972: 61: 275 - 282) or "you were sure, troubled sacred marriage-beds. / But no bride learned deception from my teaching, / no one can teach what he scarcely knows. / I made sweet pleasurable songs in such a way / that no scandal ever touched my name. / There's no husband even in the lower ranks, / who doubts his paternity through my offence. / Believe me, my character's other than my verse – / my life is modest, my Muse is playful – / and most of my work, deceptive and fictitious, /

Conclusions

The second book of "Tristia", along with other writings of Ovid's exile, testify about the sacredness of poetic inspiration and genuine condition. From them transpires a model of cultural traditions that the writer assumes, however, giving them new meanings. Evocation of his past, as biographical - existential, of the reasons of its misery and desperate attempt of rehabilitation in the eyes of Augustus, by praise and compliments on he provides any of this transpires an elegiac discourse, which discovers a special rhetorical talent. We could even say that by directing his speech, Ovid initiates the series of hyper-praised, encomiastic and decadence poems. For the poem abounds in a large number of adulations addressed to Augustus, even assimilated by Jupiter, and a series of exaggerated eulogies to the imperial family, however in order to obtain a reconsideration of his sentence.

The poem which constitutes the second book of "Tristia" is a part of *Ovid's crying* - which also features in all his writings of exile -, that addressed to the emperor Augustus from which the poet expect indulgence and clemency. To this end, Ovid drives a whole mechanism of discourse justifying the repertoires of interpretative, symbolic resources and the rhetoric of language contribute to a specific rhetorical topos. We are witnessing to a paradoxical game of nuances achieved through self-justification and self-dissolution. The poet, on the one hand, trying to justify his innocence, emphasizing on the artistic quality of his creative approach, and on the other accepts his punishment, which it believes, however, when too light when too harsh, demanding a reconsideration of its. We speak thus of a dialectic discursive approach which transpires on the one hand the despair of the poet, and on the other hand his rhetorical talent.

is more permissive than its author. / A book's not evidence of a life, but a true impulse / bringing many things to delight the ear" (Ovid, 1972: 63: 346 - 358) or "I'm undeservedly blamed..." (Ovid, 1972: 63: 327) or "I confess I'd no fear that where so many sailed, / one would be wrecked, and all the rest unharmed" (Ovid, 1972: 68: 469 - 470) or "In the end I've not seen one of all those many writers / who's been ruined by his Muse – they picked on me" (Ovid, 1972: 69: 495 - 496) or "I'd published those songs when I passed before you, / so many times, a faultless knight, as you reviewed our sins"(Ovid, 1972: 70: 541 - 542) and "but a safer, more peaceful place of exile, I beg for, / so my punishment might match the offence" (Ovid, 1972: 577 - 578).

Through discursive practices that he uses, Ovid contributes to the formation of social representations of the history of his time. By illustrating practices and certain varieties of social interaction, he provides access to some parts of socio-political and cultural landscape of contemporary reality which help to define the times where he lived.

His style, often inconsistent, which we find in the Second Book of "Tristia", authenticity helps to reduce feelings of the poet, as it transpires to the entire work of his exile. The self-justification in terms of the context in which he resides, the attempts adulation of his own judge, the intricate phrases, the emphasis on certain historical aspects, and mythological also, all this are interwoven in an argumentative discourse of maximum complexity, that contributes to resizing of own creative visions.

Bibliography:

Book

Author

[1] Billig, M. (1987). *Arguing and Thinking: A rhetorical approach to social psychology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[2] Ovid [Naso, Publius Ovidius]. (1972). „Tristia”, Book II. *Tristele și Ponticele [Tristia and Pontic Epistles]*. București: Univers, pp. 47 - 71.

[3] Potter, J. & Wetherell, M. (1987). *Discourse and Social Psychology: Beyond Attitudes and Behaviour*. London: Sage.

Editor

[1] Franga, L. & Franga, M. (2009). „Poetica relegării, relegarea poeziei” [„Poetics of rebinding, rebinding of poetry”]. *Interferențe ovidiene. Studii, note, texte și (pre)texte ovidiene, [Ovid' interference. Studies, notes, texts and (pre) texts from Ovid]*, ed. Livia Buzoianu. Constanta: Museum of National History and Archaeology, pp. 35 - 41.

[2] Gaidig, E. (2009). „Ovide et le livre II des Tristes”. *Interferențe ovidiene. Studii, note, texte și (pre)texte ovidiene, [Ovid' interference. Studies, notes, texts and (pre) texts from Ovid]*, ed. Livia Buzoianu. Constanta: Museum of National History and Archaeology, pp. 57 - 66.

Journal article

[1] Potter, J., Edwards, D. & Wetherell, M. (1993). “A model of discourse in action”. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 36(3), pp. 383 - 401.

[2] Potter, J., Wetherell, M., Gill, R., Edwards, D. (1990). “Discourse: noun, verb or social practice?”. *Philosophical Psychology*, 3, pp. 205 - 217.

[3] Răchită, C. (2014). „Ovidius și Seneca - perspective asupra exilului în Antichitate” [“Ovid and Seneca - insights into exile in antiquity”]. *Philologica Jassyensia*, An X, Nr. 1 (19), Iași, pp. 457 - 469. Retrieved from http://www.philologica-jassyensia.ro/upload/X_1supl_Rachita.pdf, at 7 februarie 2017.