of the poem: *fert animus*. While the analysis showed that the term *carmen perpetuum* must refer to more than chronology and formal transitions and suggest some kind of immanent unity in the whole thing, we must also admit that the *fert animus* is not an insignificant variation of *e. g.* Vergil's *cano* but harmonizes with the unpredictability of the poem. The *Metamorphoses* place their reader in a dilemma: he must both reject and accept discursiveness as a vehicle of development and realize that the *Metamorphoses* both are and are not *one* poem. Ovid's work seems to defy the reader's "either–or" and puts him into a state of surprise and perplexity; apparently there were many who did not feel frustrated and irritated but derived some satisfaction and pleasure from that suspense.

VII

The Minyeides and their Tales

Of all pieces of the *Metamorphoses* probably the *Pyramus and Thisbe* has enjoyed the greatest popularity and had the largest number of readers throughout the ages. Not all of its readers—perhaps comparatively few—have read it as a result of their own choice. *Pyramus and Thisbe* belongs to those texts which for better and for worse have been thrust upon generations of schoolboys. The present writer, too, first became acquainted with caesura, arsis, thesis, dactyls, spondees, *etc.* and of latin poetic word order, style and diction and, last but not least, with that strange and fascinating world which is Roman poetry by reading those 112 lines. At that stage, however, too many things were too new and too difficult to allow any deeper appreciation. What did catch our interest was the tragic story itself, the young and tender love, the romantic scenery with tomb, tree, and cave at midnight by moonlight, the savage lion and the passion of the death scenes. In that way we might be termed responsive readers. There were some things that caused trouble. The metamorphosis itself seemed to us irrelevant and disturbing. We were told, of course, that every story in the *Metamorphoses* had to contain some transformation as an excuse for being told at all; that seemed reasonable enough [1] and we accepted that the poet had here become a victim of his own principles. Another thing was the broken-pipe simile, which seemed to damage the tragic passion of Pyramus' death. We were told that ancient poets did not have the same concepts about what was "poetic" and what was not, and very often took their similes from what they saw around them and might suppose their readers to know as well. This explanation—which is embraced by Ehwald [2]—did not entirely satisfy us, but as we had no means of controlling it ourselves we tried not to be too much disturbed by thinking of broken radiators [3]. But on the whole it was quite possible to enjoy the story even though our very limited knowledge of Latin literature—at that time some books of Caesar's Gallic Wars and some of Catullus' short poems—did not allow us to realize the playfulness and

sophistication beneath the naive and romantic surface nor to have any idea at all about the *Metamorphoses* as a whole or about the place of *Pyramus and Thisbe* in that totality. When after some years I read the story again, I was surprised to realize how much it had changed with the change in my own background; I would not be able to tell whether it had become more valuable to me or less; the fact was that it had acquired a new and different value of a different nature. So this story seems to indicate both that the question of autonomy and heteronomy in the *Metamorphoses* is not an either–or but a both–and and that the poem has some kind of double nature which makes it enjoyable both to unexperienced or primitive readers, who read to learn what happens next, and to more trained consumers of poetry, whose ears are accustomed to catch the artistic refinements and who are not primarily interested in subject-matter but in the treatment of it.

The story starts with the names of the protagonists and a short presentation of them as a most handsome young man and an equally beautiful young girl from the Orient. Few readers would not already have realized at this point that what follows is going to be a romantic love-story. The names in the very beginning, linked by *et,* work as a "title" of a familiar type: *Hero and Leander, Acontius and Cydippe, Aucassin et Nicolette, Romeo and Juliet, etc.* It should be noted, however, that this type of title is far more familiar to us, who are accustomed to its use in almost every literary genre [4], than it was to ancient readers. There was no tragedy called *Hippolytus and Phaedra.* The title was either *Hippolytus* or *Phaedra.* Nor did Cinna call his epyllion *Zmyrna and Cinyras* and when Ovid refers to the Callimachean *Acontius and Cydippe* he uses only the name of the girl [5]. In Parthenius' περὶ ἐρωτικῶν παθημάτων the titles do not mention more than one of the lovers in question. The pattern with two names in the title is not, however, a modern invention. It stems from the hellenistic prose romance, works like Chariton's *Chaereas and Callirhoe,* Xenophon Ephesius' *Antheia and Habrocomes,* Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Cleitophon,* Heliodorus' *Theagenes and Caricleia,* and Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe.* The romances that have been preserved are generally much later than Ovid but Chariton is probably contemporary or earlier [6] and the socalled *Ninus-romance,* which the fragments show to have been a regular erotic romance, certainly belongs to the first century B. C. We do not know the title, but it seems to me that the fact that the girl is referred to in the fragments simply as κόρη makes it more probable that she was mentioned in the title than not [7]. What could possibly have been the point of a total suppression of the name Semiramis? The character

of the *Ninus-romance*—whatever its title actually was—is well described by Perry: "The puerile romance of Ninus has no patriotic or nationalistic orientation or significance. It relates the private affairs of a pair of teen-age lovers chafing under the restraint of middle-class social conventions, anxious above else to get married as soon as possible, if only their mothers can arrange it, and to stay married and together, come what may in the political fortunes of Western Asia and Egypt, which will be arranged to suit the convenience of the lovers and of the romance" [8]. Perry, by comparing the romance with the national saga about Ninus and Semiramis as reported by Diodorus [9], demonstrates that the romancer felt no obligation at all to respect the tradition; in fact, the characters and actions of Ninus and Semiramis of the romance have only the names and some places in common with the more or less mythical king and queen. Works of that kind were written for children and the poor-in-spirit and were never accepted in antiquity as a respectable literary genre but persistently ignored by literary critics and passed over in silence. Such silence, however, does not warrant any conclusions about the popularity of romances. They may have constituted an analogy to modern Sunday-magazine novels which form an important part of many people's, not least women's, spiritual nutrition, but which, nevertheless, have—until recently—been ignored by criticism. Ovid seems to direct the attention of his readers towards this humble kind of literature—be it romance or novella [10]. We have mentioned the "title". The heroines of the romances often have names of nymphs [11]: so Thisbe. The scene is Babylon, *i. e.* the exotic and romantic east; the name Semiramis appears in the beginnig of the story and later the lovers agree to meet at Ninus' tomb. Both hero and heroine are extremely beautiful and very young. Ovid's Pyramus and Thisbe have even less in common with the "real" Pyramus and Thisbe than the Semiramis and Ninus of the romance have with those of history or legend. Pyramus and Thisbe were a pair of lovers who became transformed into Cilician rivers; the legend, to which Nonnos alludes [12], is told by Nikolaos [13]: They loved each other. Thisbe became pregnant and killed herself. So did Pyramus. The gods pitied them and brought about their transformation into the river Pyramus and the neighbouring fountain Thisbe.—That is quite another story; yet there is no need to suppose the existence of an "Ovidian" version of the legend before Ovid, unless we think that Ovid did not have any invention of his own as far as plots are concerned. Ovid's poetry does not generally betray that kind of inferiority-complex or learned pedantry which must be inferred if we are to suppose that he would rigoristically refrain from making up stories or

his own or not allow himself to make free use of the Cilician local legend of young love, double suicide, and transformation into rivers. He made an entirely new story by changing the ethos of the love-story—the love of his Pyramus and Thisbe is what our grandparents would have called "pure"—, by inventing a new plot with a new motivation for the double suicide, and by exchanging one metamorphosis by another either of his own invention or fetched from another story; the procedure known as *contaminatio* was not forbidden by any law, nor was *inventio* [14]. The existence of two paintings of Pyramus and Thisbe from Pompei [15] do not prove that the theme was used by an Alexandrian predecessor of Ovid [16]. It is a terminological question whether the Cilician local legend of Pyramus and Thisbe—in whatever form it has come to Ovid's knowledge—can be said to be a model of writing; but there can be little doubt that it was not a model of reading, except, perhaps, for very few, extremely learned readers. As we have seen, the romance was probably among the models of reading [17]. The veto of their parents against the marriage of the young people, their ensuing decision to run away together, dramatic action on deserted graveyards, drama of error and suicide when the loved one seems lost [18] also belong to the stock-in-trade of romances, and so does both the epicisms, *e. g.* the solemn indications of morning and night [19] and the somewhat turgid rhetoric of the lovers. Into this picture the blend of straightforward narrative, sometimes with a prosaic ring and a pedantic detailedness [20], and melodrama fits well enough, and so does the grotesque simile of the broken waterpipe [21]. All this does not, of course, make the *Pyramus and Thisbe* a romance; but by exploiting some typical elements of that genre and uniting them with his own poetic virtuosity, Ovid managed to create a story which could be enjoyed naively by romance-readers and equally appreciated by more sophisticated spirits on whom the subtle literary irony and artistic play with the conventions of trivial literature [22] would not be wasted. The same holds good for another genre which has contributed a number of elements to the *Pyramus and Thisbe:* elegy. The innocent young pair uses a technique recommended by the less innocent Ovid in his *Ars* and described in his *Amores:*

conscius omnis abest, nutu signisque loquuntur.

And when standing on each side of the wall and addressing it as a living being they both perform the well-known role of an *exclusus amator;* they decide to *fallere custodes,* Thisbe steals out *callida per tenebras versato cardine,* phrases belonging to the fixture of elegy. The reader is reminded of the refined *jeu d'amour* of Roman elegy only to notice that the same

words and situations have an entirely different meaning when they are used of the tender and simple Pyramus and Thisbe in the place of young Roman *viveurs* and *demimondes.* Even when they say to the crack in the wall [23]:

quantum erat ut sineres toto nos corpore iungi

it cannot be understood as a wish for a *furtum* in the familiar elegiac sense of the word. The love of Pyramus and Thisbe is the love of children. Their erotic intentions are as vague as their feelings are strong and unalloyed.

In the next story the reader finds himself in the world of indisputably adult persons: the affair of Mars and Venus and the erotic adventures of the Sungod. In their love the element of lust is fully developed. By the short summary of the famous Homeric passage [24] the atmosphere is at once shown to be that of gay, mythological epos, that divine comedy which is so prominent a feature of the *Metamorphoses.* While the *Pyramus and Thisbe* presented itself as a moving and pathetic story, both the *Mars and Venus* and the *Solis amores* openly set out to amuse. Ovid avoids competition with Homer by dramatically abridging the story: he tells in 19 lines what Homer tells in 78; readers should supply the details from their memory rather than grow tired by a long translation. At the same time the swiftness would enhance their expectations: this unforgettable intrigue is only the *hors d'oeuvre.* To the swiftness are added Ovidian spices: quick repetitions [25], zeugma [26], paradox [27], and a new, discrete but effective, variation of the *Palatia-caeli-concetto* [28]. Notwithstanding such marked Ovidianism, this is one of the cases, where the difference between epic and elegiac narrative, between this story here and in the *Ars* [29], as formulated by Heinze [30] is most obvious. It should be noted, however, that there is a methodological trap in studying parallel versions in Ovid in order to draw general conclusions. As both Ovid and his readers were likely to have either the elegiac or the epic version in their minds, the need of making and of observing a clear difference of treatment was more urgent in those cases than elsewhere. But in other cases where there is no parallel version, the critic will have to conjecture to the best of his ability how Ovid would have told the story in another genre. That involves certain risks, especially with a poet so capricious and unpredictable as Ovid, and the danger of a vicious circle is considerable.

The function of the *Mars and Venus* is to introduce what one might call a celestial theodicy. Readers might recall an earlier use of this pattern, *viz.* the *Daphne:* there the god, here the goddess of Love is wronged by

another god and makes him suffer an apt punishment: unhappy love. Immediately he gets all those symptoms of love with which we are familiar from elegy: he is consumed by the fire of passion, he sees nothing but the girl, he cannot concentrate on his work, he is turning pale. As all these symptoms are applied to a god who is, as is often the case in Ovid, identified with his own element, the witty and paradoxical points are following closely upon each other, and Ovid achieves an additional effect by the apostrophe which allows him to put on the mask of a—moralist. The apostrophe is sustained in the following catalogue of the Sun's other mistresses: Clymene, whose name is a link to the *Phaethon,* Rhodos, Circe, and finally Clytie, who, by her *indicium,* is going to be the instrument of Venus in teaching the Sun his lesson [31]. Daphne was Apollo's first love. The Sun is by no means a beginner in the art when he falls in love with Leucothoe, and in accordance with this his technique seems to be much more effective than Apollo's. He seems to have taken Jupiter's method towards Callisto as a model by appearing in a disguise that would remove any suspicion of his real intentions. But unlike Jupiter in the *Callisto* he has at least the decency of revealing his identity before raping the girl; Jupiter had done so with Io, who immediately took to her heels, but Leucothoe's reaction towards the Sun is different: she is frightened, of course, but

victa nitore dei posita vim passa querella est [32].

Leucothoe is neither an Io nor a Lucretia but a reasonable girl.—Sol has no wife to interfere with his adventures. But the fact that he has a jealous mistress in Clytie brings him into the same kind of trouble as Jupiter. Juno cannot hit her husband directly, but satisfies her revenge by vexing the girl, and Clytie does the same by telling Leucothoe's severe father half the truth. There is a point in the fact that the Sun's *indicium* against Venus is punished by means of another *indicium.* Orchamus does not believe his daughter, who points to the Sun and cries *ille vim tulit invitae* [33], and he buries her alive. The only help the Sun can give her is to mitigate her fate and his own distress by transforming her into a frankincense-shrub. The epilogue is Clytie's metamorphosis into a heliotropium. That is the spontaneous result of her strong and, after what she has done, entirely hopeless love. So the Sun's indiscretion deprived him of two girls. But the metamorphoses secure that the end of this divine intrigue is not felt to be tragic.

The next story, about Salmacis and Hermaphroditus [34], is explicitly

introduced as an actiology. And what follows is a typical Alexandrian (or neoteric) story [35], showing a marked interest in the borderland between child and adult, combined with an inclination to deal with erotic phaenomena which were either abnormal or on the verge of being so. Hermaphroditus is a young innocent boy, shy and, as yet, without any knowledge of love, blushing at the name of it. Salmacis is a lady with more experience; she lives, *mutatis mutandis,* the life of a very expensive Roman *demimonde,* spending her time bathing her beautiful limbs in her delightful pool, combing her hair with a costly comb, looking in the mirror of her pool, putting on transparent dresses, and resting softly in the grass [36]; she is absolutely deaf when entreated by her sisters to go hunting, at least sometimes, as befits a decent nymph [37]. She uses the famous words of Odysseus to Nausikaa in a frivolous sense—just like Jupiter did to Io—by way of making a shameless proposition, thus combining elegance, or *cultus,* with immorality. The boy is confused and embarrassed and refuses the lady's advances without really knowing what she wants. He wants a bath. Thus he becomes an easy prey and once by her feigned departure Salmacis has lured him into the pool, she has him caught and actually tries to rape him. As he continues to struggle she prays that they may remain unseparable for ever, and her prayer is granted: they merge into one ambiguous body. In his distress Hermaphroditus prays that the spring shall for ever be condemned to have that enervating effect. This story is told for its own sake, of course, but it is hard to avoid the impression that it is also symbolic; when something is wrong and goes wrong, the imprint of a human being's first sexual experience may be so violent that it eventually destroys his normal behavioural pattern in that respect. The story can be read and enjoyed as an entertaining play of fantasy, mythological lore, and literary allusions [38]; it can be read as an exciting short story of suspense; but it can also be read as a kind of parable.

The *Pyramus and Thisbe,* the *Solis amores,* and the *Hermaphroditus* are placed within an elaborate frame. While everybody else in Thebes is celebrating the feast of Bacchus the three daughters of Minyas, who are against adoption of the new cult, continue their domestic work of spinning and weaving; they remain loyal to Minerva. This peaceful scene is an effective contrast both to the preceding laceration of Pentheus and to the noisy Bacchic orgies going on outside. The *Pentheus* showed what was the punishment for active resistance against Bacchus and after the Minyeides [39], whose sin is indifference and passive refusal to participate, the story of *Ino and Athamas* will show that misfortune is the lot of the most prominent adherents as well. The three sisters decide to shorten the time

by telling stories, and this delays the punishment which the reader would know is reserved for them. In view of the fact that both the first and the third of these stories are expressly marked in the text as having been carefully selected from a number of other possibilities and that all of them —except the short piece about Mars and Venus—are unknown before Ovid, it might seem reasonable to suppose that they were selected with some purpose, in other words that we are not dealing with a *Rahmenerzählung* as we know it from *e. g.* the *Decameron* or the *Arabian Nights* where the stories have nothing to do with each other nor with the person who tells them. To start with the last point, there is an obvious "tragic" irony in the fact that the sisters are telling transformation-stories while the reader knows that they are going to be transformed, in some way or other, themselves. All the three tales are love-stories and the first of them with a romance colour; that is the kind of stories that are generally supposed to be liked best by women [40]. As for the interrelation between the stories Viktor Pöschl observes that the atmosphere of the first is dark and sombre [41] whereas the tragic ends of Leucothoe and Clytie are softened by their metamorphoses into precious and beautiful plants so that their story shows light and shadow in a certain equilibrium; finally, according to Pöschl, the *Hermaphroditus and Salmacis* is a "favola luminosa", a story which "consacra per sempre la fusione dell' uomo e della donna nell'amore" [42]. There may be some truth in this observation of a line from dark to bright, although it seems to me that by making no distinction between the literal and tropical meanings of "darkness" and "brightness" Pöschl has perhaps made his point seem more plausible than it really is, and that v. Albrecht is right in saying that this "positive" line from darkness to brightness is counterbalanced by a "negative" one [43]. But there are other things which tie the tales of the three sisters together. Ovid seems to have had an inclination to go through a theme with a peculiar kind of poetic systematization. In this sequence of erotic tales the following type of pairs are represented: boy and girl, man and woman, man and girl, and woman and boy. If we consider the status of the characters within the category of *animalia rationem habentia,* we find the following pairs: two human beings, two gods, god and human being, and, finally, a pair representing the intermediate level between god and man: a nymph and a son of gods. The three stories represent different stages of love: the childish and not yet sexual love of Pyramus and Thisbe, the developed and normal sexual love of Mars and Venus and of the Sun, the virgin Leucothoe's blend of alarm and excitement at her first erotic experience, the mistress Clytie's blend of love and hatred when deceived, and, finally,

the nymphomania of Salmacis confronted with the frigidity of Hermaphroditus.

The metamorphoses, too, seem to form a recognizable pattern. Pyramus and Thisbe are separated in life—in the whole story they do not look into each others eyes except for one brief moment, *viz.* Pyramus' last one—and death prevents their union; yet, they become buried together in one tomb. The mulberries turning black is a symbol of both their death and their unification in death; their common tomb and the metamorphosis of the fruits are very closely connected in both Thisbe's prayer and in the last two lines of the story: they should not, then, be understood as two different things but as two aspects of the same thing. The Sun and Leucothoe have been united in life but are separated by her death; her metamorphosis into a plant is the only possible way to mitigate her sad fate at all. Leucothoe comes from death to a vegetative half-life because the Sun will not leave her. Clytie's case is the opposite: as the Sun leaves her, her life fades away until finally she is but a flower. The fact that they both end in the same way although metamorphosis in one of the cases is a "reward" and in the other a "punishment" indicates that at least these metamorphoses should not be interpreted in normal moral terms. Hermaphroditus and Salmacis become for ever united in life, and at Hermaphroditus' request the water of the pool acquires its enervating force. That seems to reverse the end of the *Pyramus and Thisbe;* their common tomb and the metamorphosis of the mulberries was an immortalization of a mutual but unfulfilled love, the coalescence of Hermaphroditus and Salmacis is exactly the opposite [44]. The pattern, then, is the following: the two metamorphoses in the central story go from death to plant and from life to plant. The metamorphoses in the first and in the last story are both memorial transformations accompanied by unification in death and unification in life respectively [45].

It seems, then, that there is a reward in store for the reader who takes the care to realize—or cannot help realizing—the mutual interplay of the stories; that reader who would feel, as Pöschl did, that there must be more to unite these tales than just the fact that they are told by three sisters working together some day during the Bacchic revolution; that unity in this sequence is not only a product of a frame but also an immanent coherence in spite of and, indeed, because of the apparent miscellaneousness of its constituents [46]. Yet it remains true that the pieces can be singled out and enjoyed by themselves. Ovid succeeds in doing what seems logically impossible: the stories both are and are not interdependent.

The *Minyeides* and their tales belong to Brooks Otis' section II, entitled

"The Avenging Gods" [46]. On the whole I can subscribe to his analysis of this part of the *Metamorphoses*. But it seems to me that by treating separately the Vengeance Theme, the Minor and Contrasting Love Theme, and the Central Epic Panel (*i. e.* the Perseus-sequence) Otis has made things look easier than they really are. The plan discovered by Otis is real enough and an important contribution to Ovidian scholarship; but it is by no means the only plan. There is a multitude of "plans" or "lines" or "patterns" or "anticipation-echo systems" or whatever else one might call those devices of almost every conceivable kind by which Ovid has made his epic organically grow and cohere. More obvious to any reader than Otis' section-plan is, for instance, the unity of place which exists from III, 1 to IV, 603, where everything happens in or around Thebes. This large part of the poem is framed by the fate of Cadmus, too: In the beginning he kills a snake, in the end he becomes one himself. And between these two points the reader is learning about his children and grandchildren [48]. Otis observes that Ovid does not respect the genealogical chronology and accounts well for the compositional reasons why [49]. That does not, however, destroy the reader's feeling that in this part of the poem Ovid is mainly concerned with the disasters of the Theban royal family. These are caused by divine vengeance, and finally, Cadmus overcome with grief and awed by the many portents he has seen, leaves his city, wanders out into the world with his wife until at last he arrives in Illyria, where he exclaims:

> *Num sacer ille mea traiectus cuspide serpens*
> *. . . fuerat, tum, cum Sidone profectus*
> *vipereos sparsi per humum, nova semina, dentes?*
> *ipse, precor, serpens in longam porrigar alvum* [50].

Then follows their transformation into serpents. Frances Norwood[51] has drawn attention to the value of the snake for unifying the Theban cycle; Tiresias had struck two snakes and was changed into a woman; after seven years he managed to reverse the process when he met the same pair of serpents. In the *Hermaphroditus and Salmacis* a snake makes a brief appearance in a simile [52]. Tisiphone's hair, falling over her face, is a bunch of snakes, her belt is a snake, and by means of a snake she instills fury into Ino's and Athamas' hearts [53]. We meet Perseus as he wings his way over Africa bearing the head of a snake-haired Medusa. Blood-drops from its severed neck fall on the sand of Libya and become snakes. Atlas employs a dragon to guard his orchard; he becomes a mountain at the sight of Medusa's head. Andromeda is molested by a sea-dragon and

Perseus' fight with the dragon recalls the battle between Cadmus and t dragon, and—more distantly—Phoebus' victory over Python [54]; lat the dragon in Colchis [55] will echo it. Afterwards Perseus narrates l victory over Medusa and gives her transformation story: Minerva punish her by changing her hair into snakes and she chose the Gorgo-head as a emblem for her aegis. In the fight with Phineus and his followers Miner protects Perseus with this—recently decorated—aegid, and, finally, Pe seus petrifies his enemies and Phineus by means of the Medusahead. A miss Norwood remarks: "The writhings of a snake have made a uni between Thebes and a mountain in Africa, between Cadmus and t origin of coral. What an impudent deception!" The counterpart of th sustained use of repetition with variations throughout a comparative limited part of the *Metamorphoses* is the fact that many stories echo earli stories or are to be echoed by later ones in more or less distant parts the poem. The principle of variation, so important to avoid systemat dullness, might be supposed to give the reader a feeling of being plunge into chaos. But actually the multiple interconnections of motives, wording similes, transformations, characters, *etc.* bind the whole thing togeth by a multitude of ties varying from a hardly discernible thread to an u mistakable rope. By paradox, variation is a homogenizer. The matrimoni affection of Cadmus and Harmonia recalls Deucalion and Pyrrha an anticipates the *Ceyx and Alcyone* and the *Philemon and Baucis*. Th unhappy wish of the *Semele* recalls the *Phaethon* and anticipates th *Midas,* the Sun's technique of disguise towards Leucothoe echoes th Jupiter of the *Callisto* and resembles the Vertumnus of the *Pomona*. glance at the lists of metamorphoses given by Lafaye [56] will show th care with which Ovid has mixed transformations into plants, stones, bird mammals, *etc.* throughout the whole of his poem. Ovid's technique entanglement of every kind allowed the reader to have everything else i the *Metamorphoses* in mind, consciously or unconsciously, while he wa reading and enjoying one single story. He never knows what is going t come next, but yet he is never really surprised because surprise is an esser tial part of the play itself. Ovid is so consistent in his caprice that th reader accepts it as an ordering principle. There are several genera "plans" of the poem and a very great number of sectional "plans", littl ones and big ones, outside, inside, besides and overlapping each other i every possible way. But all these plans work like the mirrors of a caleid scope. When the reader moves from one tale to another new and surprisin patterns arise. It may prove an inadequate question to ask what this poe is. The important thing to find out is how it works.

CLASSICA ET MEDIAEVALIA · DISSERTATIONES X

CHANGING FORMS

STUDIES IN THE METAMORPHOSES OF OVID

BY

OTTO STEEN DUE

GYLDENDAL
COPENHAGEN 1974