

Chapter I, Poem and Reader.

1. OTTO REGENBOGEN, *Schmerz und Tod in den Tragödien Senecas*, Vortr. d. Bibl. Warburg 1927-28, Leipzig 1930, pp. 167-218.
2. *Op. cit.*, p. 172.
3. I. A. RICHARDS, *Practical Criticism*, London 1929.

Chapter II, The literary Context.

1. *Tr.* III, 14, 37 f.: *non hic librorum, per quos inviter alarque, copia*. Cp. V, 12, 53.
2. *A. A.* III, 121 ff.
3. *A. A.* II, 121 ff.
4. *A. A.* III, 329 ff.
5. G. LAFAYE, *Les Métamorphoses d'Ovide et leurs modèles Grecs*, Paris 1904, pp. 86 f.
6. E. BETHE, *Ovid und Nikander*, *Hermes* 39 (1904), pp. 1-14; *Met.* V, 302-678 are an adaptation of part of Nicander's Ἐπεροιοῦμενα (Book IV).
7. L. CASTIGLIONI, *Studi intorno alle fonti e alla composizione delle Metamorfosi di Ovidio*, Pisa 1906, Parte terza, cap. II.
8. W. VOLLGRAFF, *Nikander und Ovid*, I, Groningen 1909.
9. E. MARTINI, *Einleitung zu Ovid*, Brünn 1933, p. 34.
10. W. KRAUS, RE, s.v. *Ovidius Naso*, p. 1939 f.
11. WILAMOWITZ, *Die Hellenistische Dichtung*, I, Berlin 1924, p. 242.
12. A. LAUDIEN, *Studia Ovidiana*, Diss. Greifswald 1905.
13. W. KROLL, RE, s.v. *Nikandros*, pp. 264 f.
14. BROOKS OTIS, *Ovid as an epic Poet*,

Cambridge 1966, (second edition, Cambridge 1970), p. 48. As the second edition is a reprint of the first with the only exception of ch. IX, Conclusion, which is entirely new, references until p. 305 will do for both editions. References to the first edition from p. 346 onwards are convertible to references to the second when one adds 29 to the page-number. On Otis' new Conclusion see below, ch. IV, n. 10.

15. See, however, note 70 to ch. II.
16. CIC. *De Or.* I, 69.
17. VERG. *Georg.* III, 425 ff. ~ NIC. *Ther.* 359 ff.
18. *Trist.* IV, 10, 43 f.
19. See the list in G. LAFAYE, *op. cit.*, Appendix A, pp. 246 f.
20. QUINT. *Inst. Or.* X, 1, 56-57.
21. L. P. WILKINSON, *Ovid Recalled*, Cambridge 1955, p. 118.
22. *Euripides, Herakles*, erklärt von WILAMOWITZ, 2. Bearb., Berlin 1909, p. 433.
23. *Met.* XIII, 685 ff.
24. ANT. LIB. *Met. Synagoge* XXV Μητύχη καὶ Μενίππη.
25. Only if we think that Ovid never arbitrarily altered his sources and models, is it necessary to assume that he must either have had another version before his eyes or falsely have read ἀνέρας instead of ἀστέρως in Nicander and then made up the rest of his story. - The reading *Coronas* in some of our manuscripts seems to be a learned attempt to bring Ovid in accordance with the tradition of the girls' catasterism; but in the context the reading is completely absurd.

26. *Met.* XIII, 713 ff.
 27. ANT. LIB. IV.
 28. ER. *frag.* 19 (Hiller) ~ *Georg.* I, 233 ff.; *Met.* I, 45 ff. alludes to the Vergilian version.
 29. Although he confines himself to the effect of Callimachus' apologetic poetry in Rome, WALTER WIMMEL has found sufficient material for a big and useful book, *Kallimachos in Rom*, Wiesbaden 1960 (Hermes, Einzelschriften 16).
 30. *Am.* I, 15, 13 f.
 31. See the discussion of the terms *ingenium* and *ars* in ETTORE PARATORE, *Ovidio e il giudizio ciceroniano su Lucrezio*, Riv. di Cult. Cl. & Med. 2 (1960), pp. 130-139.
 32. WILKINSON, *op. cit.*, p. 155. If Wilkinson's sweeping statement: "To those who are familiar with Callimachus, there is nothing novel or unique about the spirit of the *Metamorphoses*" is true, then there are only few people who are familiar with Callimachus.
 33. OTIS, *op. cit.* p. 46 f.
 34. *Met.* I, 486 f. See E. DOBLHOFER, *Ovidius urbanus*, Philologus 104 (1960), pp. 81 f.
 35. *Met.* XIII, 851 f. ~ CALL. *Hymn. Dian.* 52 ff.
 36. *Met.* III, 398.
 37. CALL. *Ep.* 30, 1-3.
 38. PLAUT. *Aulul.* 564; *Capt.* 135; for other Greek examples see A. OTTO, *Die Sprichwörter . . . der Römer*, Leipzig 1890, p. 260.
 39. - which is further corroborated by the parallel CALL. *Ep.* 30, 2 πού γέγονας; ~ *Met.* III, 397 f. *et in aera sucus corporis omnis abit.*
 40. An example is *Met.* XII, 248 f. which goes back to AP. RHOD. II, 90 f. Cp. also *Met.* IX, 474 (*Byblis*): *me miseram! tacitae quid vult sibi noctis imago* ~ AP. RHOD. III, 636 (*Medea*): *δειλή ἐγών, οἶόν με βαρεῖς ἐφύβησαν ὄνειροι.*
 41. The differences in relation to Theocritus would have been noticed, too. Cp. H. DÖRRIE, *Der verliebte Kykloß*, Der altsprachliche Unterricht 12 (1969), pp. 75-100.
 42. *Met.* III, 482 ff.
 43. THEOCR. VII, 117. It may be added that the second part of Ovid's simile is a reminiscence of HOR. *Carm.* II, 5, 10; but note that Ovid replaces the adjective *lividus* by *nondum maturus*.
 44. It seems certain that Ovid knew Anyte, too. See C. A. TRYPANIS, *Ovid und Anyte*, Cl. Phil. 65 (1970), p. 52: *Met.* X, 125 f. ~ *Anth. Pal.* VI, 312.
 45. AP. RHOD. II, 70 ff.
 46. *Aen.* VII, 586 ff., cp. I, 82 ff.
 47. *Met.* XI, 491 ff.
 48. OTIS, *op. cit.* p. 240.
 49. In VERGIL, *Aen.* V, 620, the same name appears in a similar context: Juno sends down Iris in disguise in order to provoke the Troian women to burn the ships. The Vergilian passage is supposed to be in the reader's mind when he reads the Ovidian story.
 50. *Met.* III, 284 ff.
 51. HOM. *Il.* XIV, 293.
 52. I do not think that *inevitabile* is only an *epitheton ornans*.
 53. It is an interesting coincidence that out of the four instances in the *Iliad* of double names in the language of men and gods one is *Il.* XIV, 291.
 54. LAFAYE, *ad loc.* in his Budé-edition, may be right that the *superi* may here to some extent cover the *haruspices*. If this is so, some readers may have had the pleasure of smiling like augurs.
 55. *Met.* XIII, 679 ff. In VERGIL, *Aen.* V, 535 ff. a similar *crater* is given to Acestes. It was a gift to Anchises from Cissus, the Thracian.
 56. The epanalepsis as preparation to a new piece of information about the same object is Homeric.
 57. HOM. *Il.* VII, 220 f.
 58. *viz.* the daughters of Orion, taken from Nicander with the modifications mentioned above.
 59. J. TOLKIEHN, *Homer und die römische Poesie*, Leipzig 1900, p. 191 ff., (in the chapter: *Die Verarbeitung des Homerischen Stoffes zu Episoden innerhalb grösserer Gedichte*) has a survey of Ovid's use of Homer as a source.
 60. H. TRÄNKLE, *Elegisches in Ovids Metamorphosen*, Hermes 91 (1963), p. 466, n. 3, observes a reminiscence of Hesiod

- in *Met.* XI, 594 f., *viz.* of *Theog.* 759 ff.
 61. Cp. BROOKS OTIS, *op. cit.*, second edition, p. 311 (*i.e.* in his new Conclusion) with references to Walther Ludwig and M. L. West.
 62. CIC. *Ep. ad Q. fr.* III, 4, 4.
 63. SUET. *Aug.*, 85, 2.
 64. QUINT. *Inst. Or.* X, 1, 98.
 65. HOR. *Ep.* I, 1, 67.
 66. *Am.* I, 15, 15.
 67. LAFAYE, *op. cit.* p. 143.
 68. M. v. ALBRECHT, *Nachwort zur Bibliographie*, in the reprint (Zürich/Dublin, 1966) of HAUPT/KORN/EHWALD's commentary, p. 485 f.
 69. E. MARTINI, *Ovid und seine Bedeutung für die Römische Poesie*, Ἐπιτύμβιον H. Swoboda dargebracht, 1927, p. 190.
 70. N. B. CROWTHER, Οἱ νεώτεροι, *poetae novi*, and *cantores Euphorionis*, Cl.Q.N.s. 20 (1970), pp. 322-327, draws attention to the fact that there is no evidence that Cicero meant the same group of poets by νεώτεροι or *poetae novi* as he did by *cantores Euphorionis*, and perhaps there is some probability that he did not.
 71. *Fig.* 6 (MOREL).
 72. *Fig.* 10 (MOREL).
 73. QUINT. *Inst. Or.* X, 1, 115.
 74. CAT. 95, 1 f. Cinna's poem was, of course, immensely learned, cp. SUET. *De gramm.* 18 and MARTIAL X, 21. But that fact does not warrant the conclusion that his language was complicated and his style affected.
 75. HOR. *A. P.* 388.
 76. CIC. *Tusc.* III, 45.
 77. *E. g.* CAT. 62, 42 ff. ~ *Met.* III, 353 ff.; CAT. 72, 1 ~ *Met.* VII, 801.
 78. *E. g.* CAT. 64, 180 ~ *Met.* VIII, 115 f.; CAT. 64, 397 ff. ~ *Met.* I, 127 ff.; CAT. 64, 29 ff. ~ *Met.* XI, 224 ff.
 79. *Fig.* 9 (MOREL).
 80. *Met.* I, 632.
 81. VERG. *Ecl.* 6, 47 & 52.
 82. [SERV.] *ad Ecl.* 6, 47.
 83. *Am.* I, 15, 19 f., cp. *A. A.* III, 409 f.
 84. *Tr.* II, 424.
 85. Atticus' freedman Q. Caecilius Epirota was the first to introduce Vergil as a school-text, according to SUET. *De gramm.* 16.
 86. *Met.* XIV, 812 ff., cp. *Fast.* II, 487.
 87. ENN. *Ann. frag.* I, 39 (VAHLEN): *Unus erit quem tu tolles in caerulea caeli templa.*
 88. CASSIOD. *Instit. Div. Litt.* c. I (540).
 89. *Met.* VII, 663.
 90. in his commentary to VERG. *Aen.* VI, p. 439, note 1.
 91. ENN. *Ann. frag.* I, 47, 92 (VAHLEN).
 92. ANTON ZINGERLE: *Ovidius u. sein Verhältnis zu d. Vorgängern u. gleichzeitigen röm. Dichtern*, Innsbruck (1869), II, pp. 3 ff.
 93. Cp. also *Met.* XIV, 301: *verbaque dicuntur dictis contraria verbis* ~ ENN. *Ann.* 570 V.: *pila retunduntur venientibus obvia pilis*, see S. MARIOTTI, *Un' imitazione enniana in Ovidio*, *Hommages à M. Renard I* (1969), pp. 608 f.
 94. WILKINSON, *op. cit.* p. 213.
 95. DOUGLAS LITTLE, *The Speech of Pythagoras in Metamorphoses 15 and the Structure of the Metamorphoses*, Hermes 98 (1970), pp. 340-360, - after a useful survey of the discussion - goes into great detail to prove the fact that Ovid did not believe in the reality of the mythological tales, and - more importantly - demonstrates that attempts to interpret the speech of Pythagoras as a real philosophical justification of Ovid's main theme are bound to be unconvincing. Little concludes that "Ovid included it because of its superficial correspondence with his subject-matter, but the correspondence was not meant to be examined too closely". But the incongruity between myth and philosophy is, as a matter of fact, so obvious that the message seems to be that they should be treated with the same suspension of disbelief. And we are not entitled to conclude from the absence of philosophical consistency in the *Metamorphoses* that Ovid "was not concerned. . . to produce a poem with a self-consistent unified structure".
 96. *Met.* I, 5 ~ LUCR. V, 92 & 592.
 97. *Met.* XV, 6 & 68.
 98. *Met.* XV, 150 f. ~ LUCR. II, 9 f.
 99. *Met.* XV, 153.
 100. LUCR. V, 1194.
 101. *op. cit.* p. 217.
 102. *Met.* XV, 165. Actually, we do not find

- any formal model of this statement in Lucretius, but the words might very well be used as a heading of the passage LUCR. I, 215-264.
103. R. CRAHAY & J. HUBAUX, *Sous le masque de Pythagore*, Ovidiana (HERESCŪ) 283-300, would identify Numa with Augustus and Ovid with Pythagoras. The theory has nothing to recommend itself, cp. W. KRAUS, *Anzeiger für die Altertumswissenschaft XIV*, pp. 8 f.
104. *Met.* I, 256 ff.
105. LUCR. V, 92 ff.
106. LUCR. V, 397-405; in the following verse Lucretius brands the story as unscientific phantasy.
107. *Met.* II, 205 ~ LUCR. V, 397; *Met.* II, 398 ~ LUCR. V, 403.
108. J.-M. FRÉCAUT, *Une figure de style chère à Ovide*, *Latomus* 28 (1969), pp. 28-41, analyzes Ovid's use of zeugma and shows that though the figure is characteristic of him he does not seem to use it indiscriminately.
109. *Met.* II, 304 ff.
110. For the contrast between Jupiter's traditional almightiness and the actual limitations of his power, cp. *Met.* III, 336 ff.:
At pater omnipotens (neque enim licet irrita cuiquam facta dei fecisse deo) pro lumine adempto scire futura dedit, poenamque levavit honore.
 It should be noted, too, that the hearing of the gods provides an echo of the situation in *Met.* I, 256 ff.
111. *Met.* VII, 523 ff.
112. *Met.* III, 487 f., where Narcissus is consumed by the fire of his unnatural love, ~ LUCR. VI, 515 f., where the *illustrandum* is the dissolution of clouds by wind and sun.
113. *Met.* IX, 219 ff., where Lichas is hurled through the air by Hercules and transformed into a stone, ~ LUCR. VI, 495 ff. & 527 ff., where comparable meteorological phenomena are described. It should be noted that the conventional *ferunt* in Ovid here may be pointing to the source, too.
114. - which was by the ancients commonly believed to take place, cp. VERG. *Aen.* IX, 588; SEN. *N. Q.* II, 57, 2; LUC. VII, 513; ARIST. *De Caelo* II, 7, 289 a, 19-26.
115. LUCR. VI, 177 ff.
116. *Met.* XIV, 825 f.
117. *Met.* II, 726 ff.
118. LUCR. VI, 306 ff.
119. *Met.* IV, 212 ff.
120. In *Met.* IV, 121 *crur emicat alte* there seems to be an echo of LUCR. II, 194 f. *e nostro cum missus corpore sanguis emicat exsultans alte spargitque cruorem.* The formula *Met.* IV, 122 *non aliter quam cum* is not found in Lucretius, who prefers e.g. *non alia longe ratione ac*, but nevertheless it is reminiscent of Lucretius by the accumulation of adverbs and conjunctions. The precise description of the phenomenon, *vitiato fistula plumbo scinditur et tenui stridente foramine longas eiacular aquas atque ictibus aera rumpit*, is Lucretian in nature.
121. *Ovidius u. sein Verhältnis u.s.w.*, II, pp. 25 ff.
122. See also H. TRÄNKLE, *Elegisches in Ovids Metamorphosen*, *Hermes* 91 (1963), pp. 459-476, who demonstrates that elegy does not only manifest itself in many details but also makes itself felt in the narrative technique of the *Metamorphoses*. Tränkle's paper is one of the most important correctives to Heinze's famous article.
123. *Met.* XV, 871-879.
124. HOR. *Carm.* III, 30, 1-9.
125. Cp. SEGAL, *Myth and Philosophy in Ovid's "Metamorphoses"*, *AJPh.* 90 (1969), pp. 289 ff.
126. So FRAENKEL, *Ovid, A Poet between two Worlds*, Berkeley and Los Angeles 1956, p. 111. Ovid's *carmen* would be *perpetuum* in more than one sense of the word.
127. *Trist.* IV, 10, 49 ff.
128. *Ovidius u. sein Verhältnis u.s.w.* III.
129. *Met.* X, 32 f.: *omnia debemur vobis, paulumque morati serius aut citius sedem properamus ad unam* ~ HOR. *Carm.* II, 3, 25 ff.: *Omnes eodem cogimur, omnium versatur una serius ocius sors exitura.*
130. *Met.* X, 40 ff.
131. HOR. *Carm.* III, 11, 21 ff.
132. HOR. *Carm.* I, 2, 6 ff. That this is the

- model of Ovid's passage appears from the correspondence *Met.* I, 296 *Hic summa piscem deprenidit in ulmo* ~ HOR. v. 9.
133. SEN. *N. Q.* III, 27, 14 *Non est res satis sobria lascivie devorato orbe terrarum.*
134. So also R. LAMACCHIA, *Precisazioni su alcuni aspetti dell' epica Ovidiana*, Atene e Roma 14 (1969), p. 18: L'imitazione di Virgilio . . . si estende com' è noto al di là della sezione "Virgiliana" del poema, fino a investire l'intera opera di Ovidio.
135. FRANZ BÖMER, *Ovid und die Sprache Vergils*, *Gymnasium* 66 (1959), pp. 268 ff.
136. *Met.* XIV, 104 ff.
137. *op. cit.* p. 280.
138. R. LAMACCHIA, *op. cit.* pp. 7 ff. also analyses Ovid's tale of Aeneas and the Sibyl against its Vergilian background and arrives at the following conclusion (p. 9): "[Ovidio] affronta episodi virgiliani che, per il loro contenuto sacro e profetico, sono un po' lontani dalla sua sensibilità, e nell' imitazione di essi si cimenta col suo modello, offrendo al lettore, in una diversa economia compositiva il tentativo di un' epica nuova anteroica, naturalistica".
139. *Ovidio interprete di Virgilio*, Maia 12 (1960), pp. 310 ff.
140. Cp. also the story in SEN. *Suas.* III, 7 where it is expressly stated that Ovid imitated many Vergilian lines, *non surripienti causa, sed palam mutuandi, hoc animo ut vellet agnoscere.*
141. VERG. *Aen.* IV, 646.
142. VERG. *Aen.* VII, 348.
143. *Met.* VIII, 107.
144. *op. cit.* p. 281.
145. *Met.* II, 640.
146. VERG. *Aen.* VI, 102.
147. VERG. *Aen.* IV, 501 f.
148. BÖMER, *op. cit.* p. 281 *in fine*, seems to overlook this important fact.
149. This feature is characteristic of Ovid's attitude to the conventional epic theology: an Olympian goddess personally descending into the underworld!
150. *Met.* IV, 420 ff.
151. *Met.* IV, 512.
152. *Met.* IX, 637: Byblis; X, 410: Myrrha.
153. *Met.* XIII, 871.
154. *op. cit.* 271 ff.
155. ROSA LAMACCHIA, Atene e Roma 14 (1969), p. 5 illustrates by examples as the "matronymics" *Cythereius* (*Met.* XIII, 625), *Iononia* (IX, 400), and *Iliades* (XIV, 781 and 824) the nature of Vergilian *imitatio* in Ovid with its discreetly underlying humour, perhaps also "una sottile vena parodistica".
156. S. DÖPP, *Vergilischer Einfluss im Werk Ovids*, Diss. München 1968, does not bring much new material to light and in general remains on the surface of the problems.
157. M. v. ALBRECHT, *Nachwort zur Bibliographie*, in the reprint (Zürich/Dublin 1966) of HAUPT/KORN/EHWALD's commentary, p. 486.
158. Paintings have played an important part in this respect.

Chapter III, The Ovidian Context.

- In his apologies from the shores of the Black Sea Ovid explicitly tells his reader that conclusions about his life should not be drawn from his poems (*Tr.* II, 353 ff.). He may be right. That does not mean, of course, that he had been an erotic abstainer.
- Met.* XV, 875.
- L. P. WILKINSON, *Ovid Recalled*, Cambridge 1955, p. 2.
- Am.* I, 3, 10.
- Am.* III, 13, 1.
- Am.* I, *epigr.*
- Am.* III, 15, 3.
- As observed by the commentators it is hardly a coincidence that the first word is *ama*.
- Among whom MARTINI, *Einl. zu Ovid*, Brüm 1933, pp. 62 f. and D'ELIA, *Il problema cronologico degli Amores*, Ovidiana (HERESCŪ), p. 214.
- In his edition of the second book of *Tristia*, Oxford 1924, pp. 63 ff.
- That the *Gigantomachia* is a topical device was demonstrated by PFISTER, *Rh. M.*, 70 (1915), pp. 472-477. Also KRAUS, *RE s.v. Ovidius*, p. 1972, and REITZENSTEIN, *Das neue Kunstwollen*

- i. d. *Am. Ovids*, Rh. M. 84 (1935), pp. 87 f., interpret the passage in that sense.
12. *Loc. cit.*
13. W. WIMMEL, *Kallimachos in Rom*, Wiesbaden 1960, pp. 300 ff.
14. PROP. III, 9 might also be compared, cp. WIMMEL, *op. cit.*, p. 185; but in Propertius the question in matter is not a change of genre but a change of subject-matter.
15. *op. cit.*, pp. 167 ff.
16. So the charming physical defect of *Elegeia* and the gait of *Tragoedia* – *ingenti passu*, “was sicher nicht als anmutig empfunden werden soll”, as observed by REITZENSTEIN, *op. cit.*, p. 83, note 1.
17. *Am.* III, 1, 68, where it should be noted that *labor* has some not entirely pleasant connotations.
18. U. FLEISCHER, *Zur Zweitausendjahrfeier Ovids*, *Antike und Abendland* VI (1957) pp. 31 f. suggests that *Tragoedia* really represents epic poetry. But Ovid could hardly have believed anybody to understand him in that way. He was already known as the author of the *Medea*.
19. *Am.* II, 18, 16.
20. Among others, by R. P. OLIVER, *The first edition of the Amores*, TAPhA, 66 (1945), pp. 191 ff., R. GIOMINI, *Recherche sulle due edizioni degli “Amores”*, Atti del convegno internazionale Ovidiano I, Roma 1959, pp. 125 ff., W. WIMMEL, *Kallimachos in Rom*, pp. 307 f., W. KRAUS, RE, s.v. *Ovidius*. S. D’ELIA, *Il problema cronologico degli Amores*, Ovidiana (HERESCU), pp. 210 ff. tries to prove that there are no poems in the second edition which were not in the five books.
21. W. WIMMEL, *op. cit.*, pp. 306 f., n. 1.
22. HOR. *Od.* III, 40; especially not after the correspondence between Ovid’s *Quid mihi, Livor edax* and Horace’s *quod neque imber edax*.
23. Ovid, *Die Liebeslegien*, Lat. u. Deutsch v. F. W. LENZ, Berlin 1965, commentary ad II, 19.
24. REITZENSTEIN, *Das neue Kunstwollen in den Amores Ovids*, Rh.M. 84 (1935), pp. 62–83.
25. *Ars* III, 346.
26. *The Roman Revolution*, Oxford 1939, p. 467.
27. TAC. *Dial.* 12.
28. as observed by KRAUS, RE, s.v. *Ovidius*, p. 1932.
29. *Ovid, A poet between two worlds*, Berkeley and Los Angeles 1956, p. 59.
30. *Tr.* V, 7, 27.
31. *Tr.* I, 7, 35–40.
32. As can be illustrated by a comparison between the emission of money during the first two decades of Augustus, viz. from 30–10 B.C., with that of the following 40 years: the latter amounts to only 5% of the first. See TENNEY FRANK, *The financial crisis of 33 A.D.*, *Am. J. Ph.* 56 (1935), pp. 338 ff. and same, *An economic Survey of Ancient Rome*, vol. V, Baltimore 1940, pp. 18 ff.
33. For this procedure, cp. DESSAU, *Gesch. d. röm. Kaiserzeit*, I, Berlin 1924, pp. 101 ff.
34. This example, by the way, also shows the tendency of provincials penetrating into the leading classes and particularly into the Senate, a tendency with which Augustus was not satisfied. Since the Roman People could not be Roman any more, it should at least be Italic.
35. *Tr.* IV, 10, 35 ff.
36. For Ovid’s use of his legal experience and legal terminology see E. J. KENNEY, *Ovid and the Law*, Yale Classical Studies XXI (1969), pp. 243–263.
37. See O. IMMISCH, *Horazens Epistel über die Dichtkunst*, Philologus, Supplementbd. XXIV 3 (1932). As observed by HIGHAM, *Ovid: Some aspects of his character and aims*, *Cl. Rev.* 48 (1934), the attitude of Neoptolemus and Horace was completely in accordance with that of the Emperor as described by Suetonius (89). One might imagine the irritation with which generals, governors and magistrates received schoolmasterly instructions from the Emperor in the form of excerpts from Greek and Latin literature.
38. HOR. *A.P.* 75–78.
39. the hypothesis being based on the well-known etymology of ἐλεγεῖα from εἰ ἔ λέγειν.
40. BROOKS OTIS, *Horace and the elegists*,

- TAPhA, 76 (1945). Ovid is the only poet after Gallus’ crash who mentions his name. LIDIA WINNICZUK’s paper *Cornelius Gallus und Ovid*, in *Römische Literatur der Augusteischen Zeit*, Berlin 1960, does not yield anything of interest.
41. – which were more or less inseparable from their political attitude.
42. BROOKS OTIS, *op. cit.*, p. 182.
43. HOR. *Carm.* II, 9.
44. HOR. *Carm.* I, 33 and *Epist.* I, 4.
45. HOR. *Epist.* II, 2, 90.
46. Servius tells us that Vergil in his *Georgica* (book IV) had inserted a praise of Gallus but later replaced it on the command of Augustus. Servius is generally not believed nowadays. At the bottom of the arguments against Servius is the idea that Vergil was too noble to do a thing like that. But the idea that a noble poet must also be a noble man is not confirmed by experience.
47. PROP. III, 11; IV, 6.
48. PROP. II, 10; III, 4.
49. PROP. IV, 11.
50. R. SYME, *The Roman Revolution*, Oxford 1939, p. 467.
51. *Am.* III, 13.
52. *Am.* III, 9.
53. *Am.* III, 13, 7–8; there is a close parallel in *Am.* III, 1, 1–2:
- Stat vetus et multos in caedua silva per annos;
credibile est illi munus inesse loco.*
- where the possible credulity of the reader is prevented by – *credibile est*.
54. VERG. *Aen.* VI, 662.
55. PROP. III, 1, 15 ff.
56. *Am.* I, 2, 27.
57. With the assistance of his lieutenants Flattery, Mistake, and Madness, Love conquers soldiers, men, and gods: v. 37. Which category the Emperor is thought to belong to is not easy to tell; but the list seems rather exhaustive.
58. *Am.* I, 9, 46.
59. *Am.* III, 4, 37 ff.
60. *Am.* III, 8, 51 f. (I see no reason to bracket the lines). In the *Ars Amatoria* Ovid makes fun of Vergil’s Augustus Caesar, *divi genus, aurea condet saecula* (*Aen.* VI, 792 f.): *Aurea nunc vere sunt saecula:*
- plurimus auro venit homas, auro conciliatur
Amor* (*A.A.* II, 277 f.).
61. *Ars* I, 71 ff.
62. *Ars* I, 131 ff.
63. *Ars* I, 177 ff.
64. *Ovid and the Augustans*, TAPhA 69 (1938), pp. 194–205.
65. *Fasti* I, 225, said by the god Janus.
66. *Op. cit.*
67. *Ars* I, 637 ff.
68. *Rem.* 361 ff.
69. *Rem.* 359 f.
70. *Rem.* 363 f.; the expression *unus et alter* is equally vague but more derogatory than *quidam*.
71. *Rem.* 371; the vagueness is rather demonstrative.
72. Cp. SUET. *Aug.* 89,6: *Ingenia saeculi sui omnibus modis fovit. Recitantis et benigne et patienter audit, nec tantum carmina et historias, sed et orationes et dialogos. Componi tamen aliquid de se nisi et serio et a praestantissimis offendeatur, admonetque praetores ne paterentur nomen suum commissionibus obsoleferi.*
73. *Fasti*, II, 139.
74. *Fasti*, II, 142.
75. SUET. *Aug.* 53, 1–2: *Domini appellatorem ut maledictum et opprobrium semper exhorruit. Cum spectante eo ludos pronuntiatum esset in mimo: O dominum aequum et bonum! et universi quasi de ipso dictum exultantes comprobassent, et statim manu vultuque indecoras adulationes repressit et insequenti die gravissimo corripuit edicto: dominumque se posthac appellari ne a liberis quidem aut nepotibus suis vel serio vel ioco passus est atque eius modi blanditias etiam inter ipsos prohibuit.* – The attitude of the Emperor should not necessarily be branded as hypocrisy. Probably he was sincerely persuaded that he was administering a republic.
76. WILKINSON, *Ovid Recalled*, p. 338.
77. The relegated poet proudly asserts that his nobility is second to none: *Tr.* II, 109 ff.:
- illa nostra die, qua me malus abstulit error,
parva quidem perii, sed sine labe domus:
sic quoque parva tamen, patrio dicitur ut aevo
clara nec ullius nobilitate minor, etc.*
78. S. G. OWEN, *Tristia I*, Oxford 1885, pp. 12–19.

79. *Ovid Recalled*, pp. 303 ff.
 80. SUET. *Aug.* 71,3 ff. With regard to adultery, i.e. affairs with other citizens' wives, Ovid could claim that his name had never been connected with any scandal of that kind: *Tr.* II, 349 f. Augustus could not: SUET. *Aug.* 69.
 81. *Tr.* II, 295 f.
 82. *Tr.* II, 534 f.
 83. WILDE, *The Picture of Dorian Gray*, 1891, *The Preface*.
 84. *Tr.* III, 7, 45 ff.
 85. Although originally a monarchistic philosophy Stoicism had become a republican ideology in Rome. Cp. the present writer's *Lucain et la philosophie*, XV^e Entretiens de la Fondation Hardt, Genève 1970, pp. 204 ff.
 86. SEN. *Ben.* III, 26, 1.
 87. *Id. ibid.* 27, 1: *Sub divo Augusto nondum hominibus verba sua periculosa erant, iam molesta*.
 88. SALVATORE D'ELIA, *L'Esilio di Ovidio e alcuni aspetti della storia Augustea*, Ann. Fac. Lett. e Fil. Univ. di Napoli, V (1955), p. 145 f.
 89. R. MARACHE, *La révolte d'Ovide exilé contre Auguste*, Ovidiana (HERESCU), p. 418.
 90. *Tr.* III, 1, 71 f.
 91. *Op. cit.* p. 417.
 92. SEN. *Controv.* II, 4, 13: ... *qui tanti putant caput potius quam dictum perdere*. Seneca praises the tolerance of Augustus. But this tolerance was not always reliable. Even members of his family did not feel secure when surprised with controversial books in their hands. The strength of his power enabled him to permit a certain freedom of speech but he arbitrarily and unpredictably reserved for himself the right of determining the limits of it, and in his later years he was narrowing those limits.

Chapter IV, The Augustan Context.

1. *Ovid and the Augustans*, TAPhA 69, 1938, pp. 228 f.
2. Cambridge 1966.
3. *Op. cit.*, Preface (to the first edition), p. VII (= second edition, Cambridge 1970, p. XI).

4. *Met.* XV, 445.
5. *Met.* XV, 420 ff.
6. Cp. CHARLES SEGAL, *Myth and philosophy in the "Metamorphoses", Ovid's Augustanism and the Augustan conclusion to book XV*, *AJPh.* 90 (1969), p. 288: "the eternity of Rome is just what Ovid does not assert. Ovid in fact surprises us by withholding what we expect: a reference to the fairly common Augustan idea of *Roma Aeterna*".
7. *Aen.* I, 278 f.
8. *Op. cit.*, Preface (to the first edition), p. VII (= second edition p. XI).
9. *Op. cit.*, Preface (to the first edition), p. VIII (= second edition p. XII).
10. I am speaking of the Conclusion in the first edition of Otis' book. By substituting an entirely new Conclusion in the second edition for that of the first edition (see above, ch. II, n. 14) Otis has certainly made a gesture in the direction of greater honesty in scholarship but also caused some confusion. It seems to me that his first edition is a consistent work, where premises and conclusion are in accordance with each other. Otis' views in his new Conclusion are on some points nearer to my own and I think that these 69 pages represent some progress towards a better understanding of Ovid. But they are not a conclusion to the book where they are inserted. When Otis states (p. 308) that the first eight chapters represent a stage in his thinking and perhaps in the history of Ovidian research that he has no wish to alter, I fail to see why that does not apply to the ninth as well. The omission of the original Conclusion has certainly made it more difficult for readers to perceive the difference between Otis' opinions of 1964 and his opinions of 1968. I feel that one must - in spite of the author himself - vindicate the unity and consistency of the first edition against the hybridity which makes the second falter. I have therefore decided to consider Otis' book (in its original form) and his new Conclusion as two distinct and separate contributions to Ovidian scholarship.
11. *Op. cit.* p. 3.
12. OTIS, *op. cit.* (1970), p. 368.
13. WILKINSON, *Ovid Recalled*, p. 311.
14. That Ovid's Augustanism - especially in the last books - is not to be believed naively at face value is eloquently demonstrated by CHARLES SEGAL, *Myth and philosophy in the "Metamorphoses"*, *AJPh.* 90 (1969), pp. 257-292. Segal may sometimes go a little too far in his interpretations, but on the whole the evidence he adduces seems to prove his thesis: that the Ovidian nod to Augustan ideals is deliberately ironical rather than polite. The present writer owes much to this important paper.
15. As V. BUCHEIT, *Mythos und Geschichte in Ovids Metamorphosen I*, *Hermes* 94 (1966), pp. 80-108, who draws attention to the Augustan symbols and the prominent place they occupy in Book I and elsewhere, but fails to realize that Ovid is constantly undercutting their effects. Ovid should not be read as gravely as he is by Bucheit.
16. *Met.* I, 163 ff.
17. *Met.* I, 89-99.
18. *Met.* I, 99-112.
19. In the form: *Libertatis P. R. vindex*, see *Coins of the Roman Emp. in the British Mus.* by H. MATTINGLY, vol. I (1965), p. 112.
20. *Ars* II, 277.
21. *Met.* I, 145.
22. *Met.* I, 147.
23. *Met.* I, 149.
24. *Ars* III, 121 f.
25. *Met.* I, 154 f.
26. *Met.* I, 166.
27. *Met.* I, 199 ff.
28. See SYME, *The Roman Revolution*, p. 333 f.
29. *Op. cit.* p. 479.
30. *Ovids Humor, Ein Schlüssel zur Interpretation der Metamorphosen*, *Der allsprachliche Unterricht* 6 (1963), p. 51.
31. *Arg.* III, 1 ff.
32. This is the general tendency and I am quite aware of the generalization; sometimes, as in Callimachus' *Hymn to Delos*, vv. 162 ff., humour and the praise of kings are combined, but very discreetly.
33. U. FLEISCHER, *Zur Zweitausendjahr-*

feier Ovids, Antike und Abendland VI (1957), p. 36, demonstrates that here Ovid also turns the Homeric pattern of similes upside down. He introduces the *illustrans* with *sic* instead of *ut*.

34. *Met.* I, 175 f.
35. - which is introduced by the line (208): *Iuppiter hoc iterum sermone silentia rupit*, where there is some tension between the high level of the rest of the line (and of the preceding lines as well) and the comparatively low *sermo*. What follows seems, however, more like a *sermo* than an *oratio* when compared with Jupiter's first speech. Having secured unanimous loyalty Jupiter can relax a little.
36. *Met.* I, 253 ff.
37. *Met.* I, 562 f.
38. *Met.* II, 411 f. In his Heidelberg dissertation from 1971, *Ovidius Narrans*, TH. DÖSCHER has given a very thorough interpretation or rather a *commentarius perpetuus* of the Callisto - Arcas complex (pp. 3-85). Together with an equally detailed interpretation of the *Actaeon* (pp. 86-145) it confirms his thesis that Ovid is anything than careless in composition and characterization.
39. *Met.* IX, 23 ff.
40. *Met.* I, 21; 32; 57; 79.
41. *Met.* I, 72 ff.
42. *Met.* I, 76 ff.
43. *Met.* I, 188 ff.:

*Per flumina iuro
 infera, sub terras Stygio labentia luco
 cucuta prius temptata; sed immedicabile
 corpus, etc.*

This is another example of surprise-effect. After the very solemn oath follows a tame excuse.

44. *Met.* I, 251 f.
45. *Met.* I, 414 f. The lines provide a good proof of the point that the meaning of a statement is highly dependent on who makes it. Vergil, too, writes about Deucalion's stones, *Georg.* I, 63: *unde homines nati, durum genus*.
46. OTIS, *Ovid as an Epic Poet* (1966), p. 116.
47. *Met.* II, 40 f., prepared by 22 f. and taken up again in 124 f.
48. *Met.* II, 304-6; OTIS, *op. cit.*, p. 115.
49. *Met.* II, 396 f.
50. *Op. cit.*, p. 116.

51. OTIS, *op. cit.*, in the general conclusion of his book, p. 307.
52. *Met.* III, 1 - VI, 400.
53. *Met.* IV, 604 - V, 249.
54. OTIS, *op. cit.*, p. 307.
55. *Op. cit.*, in the chapter The Avenging Gods, III, pp. 159-165.
56. *Op. cit.*, p. 159.
57. *Op. cit.*, p. 164.
58. *Op. cit.*, pp. 163 ff.
59. In his new Conclusion (see above, note 10), pp. 346 ff. Otis defends the view that the *Perseus* is "deliberate bathos, a true parody of epic". From that point of view he thinks that it is not bad at all. And it fits well into the anti-Augustan plan of the *Metamorphoses*, better, it must be admitted, than into the Augustan plan. But cp. above, pp. 68-69.
60. We are quite familiar with violence but mainly from the cinema or from television and although we are, of course, against violence in principle we are often secretly attracted by it. A conscious interest in the phenomenon of violence and artistic treatments of it can be found both in literature and in other arts in our time as witness the films of Kurosawa.
61. *Met.* IV, 614-626; this may be taken as a faint echo of the Phaethon-epic.
62. *Met.* IV, 642 ff.; Hercules is one of the main characters in the "central panel" of Otis' third section (VI, 401-XI end).
63. *Met.* IV, 678 f.:
*Ut stetit, "O" dixit "non istis digna catenis,
sed quibus inter se cupidi iunguntur amantes".*
J.-M. FRÉCAUT, *L'esprit et l'humour chez Ovide*, Grenoble 1972, p. 30, draws attention to the fact that this kind of *jeu de mots* is a characteristic feature of the erotic language of the time.
64. *Met.* IV, 740 ff.
65. *Met.* IV, 772 ff.
66. *Met.* I, 700 ff.
67. *Met.* V, 236 ff.
68. e.g. *Met.* V, 10 ~ VERG. *Aen.* IX, 136 ff.; *Met.* V, 41 ~ VERG. *Aen.* VII, 593 ff.
69. *Met.* VIII, 260 - IX, 272.
70. *Met.* VI, 401 - XI end. "The Pathos of Love".

71. In his new Conclusion Otis leaves it to his reader to reinterpret this "central panel" in analogy with his new appreciation of the *Perseus*. Cp. above, note 59.
72. OTIS, *Ovid as an Epic Poet*, 194 ff.
73. *Op. cit.*, p. 199: "The combination of epic and tragic elements in the *Meleager* and *Hercules* is thus justified by Ovid's purpose: to relate these heroic episodes to his major theme of erotic passion and to show their difference from it - their epic quality, the transcendence of erotic passion and catastrophe by heroic merit and deserved apotheosis. Hercules here, as in the eighth book of the *Aeneid*, prefigures and anticipates the later apotheosis of Aeneas, Romulus and Augustus and paves the way for the Roman dénouement of the whole poem. Furthermore, Ovid here, as in the preceding *Perseus* panel, wanted to fortify the centre of the longest section of his poem by the weight and grandeur of epic material".
74. *Met.* VIII, 365 ff. Line 368 may be read as a fine specimen of Ovid's empathetic irony:
despexitque, loco tutus, quem fugerat, hostem.
75. *Met.* VIII, 378 f.
76. *Met.* VIII, 406 f.
77. - which are quoted by Otis in order to demonstrate how Ovid *malgré lui* frustrates the epic tone and gravity.
78. *Met.* VIII, 276; Vergil coined the expression *di agrestes* for "rural deities" (*Georg.* II, 493: *fortunatus et ille, deos qui novit agrestes*); Tibullus, an elegist, repeatedly permitted himself the use of the combination *deus agricola* (*TIB.* I, 1, 14; 5, 27; cp. II, 1, 36 (*agricolae caelites*)); Ovid takes another step speaking of "peasants" - and this in his epic poem!
79. *Met.* VIII, 282 f.
80. *Met.* VIII, 335 ff. One or two of the plants would have been enough according to normal epic convention. Ovid has six.
81. OTIS, *op. cit.*, p. 200.
82. *Met.* VIII, 562 ff., cp. 574.
83. *Met.* VIII, 591 ff. They are refinedly light-dressed.

84. *Met.* VIII, 629 ff.
85. *Met.* IX, 87 ff.
86. *Met.* IX, 23 ff. See above p. 73.
87. *Met.* IX, 67. I quite agree with OTIS (p. 200) that we might perhaps not so inappropriately translate it by: 'That is babystuff for me!'
88. *Met.* IX, 111 f.:
*Pallentemque metu fluviumque ipsamque
tumentem
tradidit Aonius pavidam Calydonida Nesso.*
89. *Met.* IX, 115 ff.
90. *Met.* IX, 122.
91. OTIS, *Ovid as an Epic Poet*, p. 200.
92. Otis' opinion in his new Conclusion (p. 349) does Ovid less injustice than his previous verdict, but still some.
93. *Met.* IX, 203 f. The hero of Stoicism is on the verge of becoming an atheist!
94. *Met.* IX, 155.
95. *Met.* IX, 211 ff.
96. *Met.* IX, 218.
97. *Met.* IX, 220 ff.
98. *Met.* IX, 224 f.; Ovid seems slyly to excuse himself with *prior edidit aetas*.
99. *Met.* IX, 235 ff.:
*congeriem silvae Nemeaeae vellere summam
sternis et imposita clavae cervice recumbis,
haud alio vultu, quam si conviva iaceres
inter plena meri redimitus pocula sertis.*
Especially in the last point there is a certain Epicurean note.
100. *Met.* IX, 239 ff.
101. *Met.* IX, 255 f.
102. *Met.* IX, 244.
103. *Met.* IX, 251. In line 256: *siquis tamen Hercule*, *siquis* the reader might believe that *Hercule* is an oath, but the following *forte deo doliturus erit* would show him that Ovid did not go that far.
104. It is used by VERGIL, *Aen.* II, 471 ff., to illustrate the terrifying appearance of Pyrrhus as a new Achilles.
105. *Met.* IX, 270.
106. *Met.* IX, 273.
107. *Met.* XII-XV.
108. *Met.* XIV, 154-222 ~ VERG. *Aen.* III, 588-683.
109. as done by OTIS, *op. cit.*, p. 74. So also in his new Conclusion, pp. 350 f. and p. 361.
110. *Her.* III.
111. viz. the story about Ulysses and Circe (which again gives occasion to the story about Picus and Canens).
112. As a few examples among many of this procedure developed in details the following places may be mentioned: *Met.* XII, 86 ff., where Cygnus tells Achilles that his splendid armour is not for use but for show just like that of Mars; *Met.* XIII, 288 ff., where Ulysses blames Ajax for being too stupid to appreciate the artistic value of Achilles' arms; *Met.* XIV, 566 ff., where Ovid applies a realistic psychology of conflict to the heroic fight between *Latini* and *Rutulii*.
113. *Met.* XIV, 584.
114. *Met.* XIV, 585; this *ambierat* tends to draw the preceding *tempestivus* into its own "political" sphere: Aeneas shall be a god *suo anno*.
115. *Met.* XIV, 588 ff. Cp. Otis' new Conclusion pp. 359 f.
116. *Tr.* II, 64.
117. *Met.* XIV, 805 ff.
118. *Met.* XIV, 825 f.
119. Cp. above p. 32.
120. *Met.* XV, 750 f. I do not consider it fortuitous that this official historical term is employed here.
121. Ovid insists, demonstratively, on words of real parentage: *progenies* (750) *pater exitit huius* (751) *genuisse* (758) *semine cretus* (760) *natus* (819). This insistence provokes the reader's knowledge of the adoption. The flattery reveals itself as flattery.
122. *Met.* XV, 760 f.
123. *Met.* XV, 764.
124. *Met.* XV, 804 ff. Ovid does not distort the mythological facts; yet it may be doubted whether it was quite tactful to mention the pious hero of Rome in the same breath as the notorious adulterer of Helena.
125. *Met.* XV, 811 f.
126. *Met.* XV, 820 ff.
127. H. DESSAU, *Mommsen und das Monumentum Ancyranum*, *Klio* XXII (1928), 261 ff.
128. *Met.* XV, 830 f.
129. *Met.* XII, 187 f.: *vixi annos bis centum; nunc tertia vivitur aetas*. KORN-EHWALD, *ad loc.*, maintains that Ovid misunderstood HOM. *Il.* I, 250 ff.,

taking δύο γενεαί to mean *duo saecula* in the sense of two centuries. It seems, however, quite unlikely that Ovid should not have been aware of the different current meanings of the word *saeculum*. He is deliberately misinterpreting Nestor's epithet in Laevius (GELL. XIX, 7, 13), *trisaeculeniex*, thereby making of Nestor not only a reverend old man but a veritable Methuselah.

130. *Met.* XV, 865: *et cum Caesarea tu, Phoebae domestice, Vesta*. In 12 B.C. Augustus as *pontifex maximus* did not want to live in the official residence, *Regia*, on the *Forum* near the temple of *Vesta*, and therefore the official worship of that goddess was in part transferred to an *Aedicula Vestae* in his own house on the Palatine. After that *Vesta* could be said to belong to the private gods of Augustus along with *Apollo* who by the consecration of his temple in 28 B.C. just outside the residence of Augustus had already become a "member of the imperial household".
131. See above p. 35.
132. SYME, *The Roman Revolution*, p. 317.

Chapter VI, The First Book.

- M. v. ALBRECHT, *Zum Metamorphosenproem Ovids*, Rh. Mus. CIV (1961), pp. 275 ff., convincingly defends the text against Fleischer's conjecture *illis* (*Zur Zweitausendjahrfeier Ovids*, Antike und Abendland VI (1957), pp. 51 ff.). G. LUCK proposes – as P. LEJAY before him in his edition (Paris 1894) – to read (with one of the mss.) *illa* (*Hermes* 86 (1958), pp. 499 f.) and paraphrases *nam vos non modo formas quales dicere incipiam, sed etiam coepta mea mutastis*. This seems to me to be more Ovidian than Ovid himself.
- H. FRAENKEL, *Ovid: A Poet between two Worlds*, p. 75 with note on p. 208.
- U. FLEISCHER, *op. cit.*, pp. 31 f., justly underlines the importance of this fact.
- In his elegiac narrative poem, the *Fasti*, Ovid has *canam* in the preface. It seems to have been his habit to enrich his epic style by "elegiac" elements and *vice versa*.
- FLEISCHER, *op. cit.*, pp. 51 ff., tries to

prove that the tone of Ovid's proemium is subjective and colloquial. M. v. ALBRECHT, Rh. Mus. CIV (1961), pp. 269–274, demonstrates that this is wrong, but he goes too far in the opposite direction and exaggerates the solemnity of the four lines. The important thing here is the difference between the poems of the *Aeneid* and the *Metamorphoses*. And that seems to be clear enough.

6. VERG. *Georg.* I, 40.
7. *Tr.* II 555 ff.:
dicitaque sunt nobis, quamvis manus ultima
coeptis
defuit, in facies corpora versa novas.
atque utinam revoces animum paulisper ab
ira,
et vacuo iubeas hinc tibi pauca legi,
pauca, quibus prima surgens ab origine
mundi
in tua deduxi tempora, Caesar, opus,
etc.
8. Cp. VERG. *Ecl.* VI, 4 f.:
"pastorem, Tityre, pinguis
pascere oportet ovis, deductum dicere car-
men".
9. The most important recent contributions to the discussion are HANS HERTER, *Ovids Kunstprinzip in den "Metamorphosen"*, *AJPh* 69 (1948), pp. 129–148, U. FLEISCHER, *Antike und Abendland VI* (1957), pp. 57 ff., M. v. ALBRECHT, Rh. Mus. CIV (1961), pp. 13 ff., and OTIS, *Ovid as an Epic Poet*, pp. 45 ff.
10. AR. *Poet.* 23 (1459a).
11. HANS HERTER, *AJPh* 69 (1948), p. 141, n. 34: "*Ἄεισμα διηγεκέας = Carmen perpetuum* bedeutet also mehr als "eine den Stoff in zusammenhängender Erzählung bietende Darstellung" (so MARTINI, *Einleitung*, 30) und kann nicht ein Kollektivgedicht nach Art der Aitia bezeichnen (so I. KAPP, *Philologus LXXXIV* (1929), 176): die Kontinuität die der Terminus meint, ist nicht durch eine beliebige Verknüpfungsmotivik sondern durch die zeitliche Abfolge bestimmt. Freilich wird ein solches Gedicht erst dann homerisch, wenn es einen grösseren Umfang erreicht: das ist, wie bei Kallimachos durch ἐν πολλαῖς χιλιάσιν, so bei Ovid durch *prima*

- ab origine mundi ad mea tempora* ausgedrückt".
12. *Op. cit.* p. 147.
13. *Op. cit.* p. 146: "Es bedeutete freilich ein Äusserstes an ζῆλος 'Ομηρικός, wenn er das Gesetz des epischen Genos einem Stoffe aufdränge, der ihm so wenig entgegenkam". – It should be noted, however, that there is nothing in Ovid's proem which could be said to render Callimachus' ἐν. ECKART MENSCHING, *Carmen perpetuum novum?*, *Mnemosyne* 22 (1969), pp. 165–169, justly underscores this fact.
14. – and, it might be added, in Roman literature, the closest equivalent being *carmen continuum et longum* in PLIN. *Ep.* VII, 9, 9.
15. HOR. *Carm.* 1, 7, 6.
16. *Op. cit.*, p. 139, n. 29.
17. The lines of Horace run: *Sunt quibus unum opus est intactae Palladis uben/carmine perpetuo celebrare eludique descriptam fronti praeponeere olivam*. Here *perpetuo* may be taken either as a kind of *enallage*: "to sing without cease the praise of Athens", – and in that case Horace's expression cannot be compared with Ovid's at all – or as meaning simply "long"; the poem to which Horace refers would be open to Aristotelian criticism for lacking epic unity, the place, apparently, being the principle of arrangement in it; besides, it is not necessary to suppose that Horace had any particular poem in mind, but it may have been Euphorion's *Μοφοπία ἢ ἄτακτα*, which KIESSLING-HEINZE *ad loc.* give as an example. In HAUPT-EDWALD-v. ALBRECHT it is taken for granted that Horace refers to Euphorion's poem, though no substantiation is offered.
18. That does not, of course, mean that Ovid did not invest much learning in and pay great attention to the legendary chronology in order to create a workable illusion of unbroken progression in time. See P. GRIMAL, *La chronologie légendaire dans les Métamorphoses*, *Ovidiana* (HERESCU), pp. 245–257.
19. LUCR. V, 548.
20. I think that this is a transition of which Quintilian, too, would have approved.
21. *Met.* I, 7.
22. *Met.* I, 7 ff.; 67 f.
23. *Met.* I, 20. Cp. BÖMER (*Comm. ad 19*): "Ovid bedient sich hier einer beinahe technisch-naturwissenschaftlich exacten, vorwiegend prosaischen Terminologie; in besonderem die Substantivierungen im Plural sind poetisch ungewöhnlich. Vgl. etwa CIC. *Rep.* III, 13: *ut calida et frigida et amara et dulcia, etc.*".
24. *Met.* I, 52 f.:
aer, qui, quanto est pondere terrae
pondus aquae levius, tanto est onerosior igni.
 For the text, cp. BÖMER (*Comm. ad loc.*).
25. *Met.* I, 78 ff.
26. LUCR. II, 655 ff.
27. *Met.* I, 10 ff., where *Tellus* should probably be read with an initial capital.
28. *Met.* I, 34 f.
29. Ovid's ability to make the difficult easy matches, and forms an amusing counterpart to, his knack of doing the opposite: *Met.* I, 52 f.
30. E.g. PLAT. *Tim.* 33 b ff.; DIOG. LAERT. 8, 35 (Pythagoras). CICERO (*Tim.* 17) translates Plato's passage with considerable additions, which make the thought appear more "scientific": *Hanc igitur habuit rationem effector mundi et molitor deus, ut unum opus totum atque perfectum ex omnibus lotis atque perfectis absolveret, quod omni morbo et senio vacaret. Formam autem ei maxime cognatam et decoram dedit; a quo enim animanti omnis reliquias contineri vellet animantes, hunc ea forma figuravit, qua una omnes formae reliquiae concluduntur, et globosum est fabricatus, quod σφαιροειδές Graeci vocant, cuius omnis extremitas paribus a medio radiis attingitur, idque ita tornavit ut nihil efflicere posset rotundius, nihil asperitatis ut haberet, nihil offensionis, nihil incisum angulis nihil anfractibus, nihil eminentis nihil locuosum – omnesque partes simillimae omnium, quod eius iudicio praestabat dissimilitudini similitudo.*
31. *Met.* I, 73 ff.
32. E.g. PLAT. *Tim.* 39 e ff.; AR. *De gen. an.* 761 b declares that there must also be some "animals" belonging to the fire and locates them on the moon since they, too, must be corporeal. In *De Respir.*

- 477 a he says that plants belong to earth, fish to water, and terrestrial animals and birds to air and fire; he is speaking about the predominant element in their constitution, for in *Meteor.* 382 a he says that animals are not found in air or fire but only on earth or in water. CICERO, *Nat. deor.* II 42, tells us that Aristotle thought it impossible that there should not be animals in that element which was most fit for producing them, viz. in fire. If Cicero has not misunderstood Aristotle or quoted from a work falsely attributed to him, Aristotle seems to have contradicted himself. — For later examples of the thought, see PEASE *ad* CIC. *Nat. deor.* I, 103.
33. CIC. *Nat. deor.* II, 42.
34. CIC. *Nat. deor.* II, 70. Balbus is speaking about the *commenticū et ficti dei* and the *superstitiones paene aniles* attached to them: *Et formae enim nobis deorum et aetates et vestitus ornatusque noti sunt, genera prae-terea coniugia cognationes, omniaque traducta ad similitudinem imbecillitatis humanae. Nam et perturbatis animis inducuntur: acceperimus enim deorum cupiditates aegritudines iracundias; nec vero, ut fabulae ferunt, bellis proliisque caruerunt, nec solum ut apud Homerum cum duo exercitus contrarios alii dei ex alia parte defenderent, sed etiam ut cum Titanis ut cum Gigantibus sua propria bella gesserunt. Haec et dicuntur et creduntur stultissime et plena sunt futilitatis summaeque levitatis.* He proceeds to make it clear that e.g. Ceres and Neptunus could be and should be venerated as different manifestations of the one god.
35. Sometimes, however, out of respect for tradition and in order to serve the edifying purpose of showing that the gods do care, the philosophers slip back into those mythological concepts which they ridicule elsewhere. So Balbus, in CIC. *Nat. deor.* II, 6, unctuously commemorates the cavalry support which on different occasions the Romans received from the *Tyndaridae*, and he maintains that the voices of *Fauni* and the appearance of *formae deorum* ought to convince atheists! Both here and in *Nat. deor.* II, 70, quoted in the preceding note and — of course — in VERG. *Aen.* IV, 556, the expression refers to anthropomorphical gods.
36. CIC. *Nat. deor.* I, 116.
37. How ridiculous appears from *Met.* I, 174.
38. "Why quarrel about metaphysics?" as WILKINSON puts it, *Ovid Recalled*, p. 214.
39. The only and vague indication of it being the *melior natura* of line 21.
40. Above p. 70.
41. Ovid says *aether* in line 151 and *regnum caeleste* in the following line, thus combining the philosophical and the mythological concept of Heaven as if there were no difference at all.
42. Ovid uses *securus* in line 151; it should be noted that at Ovid's time this word had not yet become a synonym of *tutus*. By using it Ovid focuses the attention upon the subjective feelings of the gods rather than upon their objective position as rulers of the world.
43. *Met.* I, 160 ff.
44. That a situation of this kind could be exploited in a divine farce was later discovered by LUCIAN, *Iup. Trag. and Deor. Conc.*
45. *Met.* I, 246 ff.
46. VERG. *Aen.* X, 1 f.
47. I, 166 f.; cp. above p. 71.
48. Cp. above pp. 71 f.
49. In Vergil there is a short indication of the place:
sideream in sedem terras unde arduus omnis castraque Dardanidum aspectat populosque Latinos.
In Ovid the reader is confronted with a regular — but considering the nature of the place described — not very typical *τοπογραφία*.
50. I, 163 ff. There is a quantitative and qualitative climax from *Quod pater ut summa vidit Saturnius arce, ingemit ut factum nondum vulgata recenti foeda Lyaoniae referens convivium mensae ingentes animo et dignas Iove concipit iras.*
51. Cp. above p. 71.
52. Cp. e.g. CIC. *Cat.* I, 30 I; *Sest.* 135: *Et cohortari ausus est accusator in hac causa vos, iudices, ut aliquando essetis severi aliquando medicinam adhiberetis rei publicae. Non ea est medicina, cum sanae parti corporis scalpellum adhibetur atque integrae, carnifi-*

- cina est ista et crudelitas: ei medentur rei publicae qui execrant pestem aliquam tantquam strumam civitatis.*; *Phil.* VIII, 15: *In corpore si quid eius modi est quod reliquo corpori noceat, id uti secarique patimur ut membrum aliquod potius quam totum corpus intereat. Sic in rei publicae corpore, ut totum saluum sit, quicquid est pestiferum amputetur.*
53. This divine class-society is prepared by (and follows up) the distinction between *plebs* and *nobilitas* in the *descriptio caeli*.
54. So K. PRESTON, *Class. Philol.*, 14 (1919), p. 178; cp. CIC. *Imp. Pomp.* 14 ff.
55. Sc. *semideos, rustica numina, etc.*
56. *Met.* I, 196 ff.
57. *Met.* I, 211-219; 220-229; 230-239.
58. HOM. *Od.* XVII, 485 ff.: *καὶ τὸ θεοὶ ξείνοισιν ἐοικότες ἄλλοδαποῦσιν, πάντοιοι τελέθοντες ἐπιστροφῶσι πόλιν αἰετῶν ἀνθρώπων ὕβριν τε καὶ εὐνομίην ἐφορῶντες.*
59. AP. RHOD. III, 66 ff.
60. OV. *Fast.* V, 495 ff.
61. That Lycaon intended to kill Jupiter seems to be an innovation; in Apollodorus Lycaon kills a boy from the neighbourhood, in Ovid his crime is made worse: he slaughters a foreign hostage.
62. The readers knew that the human race was totally degenerated — with the exception of Deucalion and Pyrrha — and, accordingly, they would not have expected Jupiter to be treated so well by the common man if he had retained his incognito.
63. The making of which is neatly and, — as befits the genre of epiphany — circumstantially described. The details intensify the horror of the act. *Unius* is not, as HAUPT-EHWALD-v. ALBRECHT's commentary says, equivalent to *τύνης*. The enumerated examples of this use of *unus* in Ovid (*Met.* VI, 578; VIII, 786; *Fast.* IV, 79; V, 664) are not parallels at closer inspection. The reference to J. B. HOFMANN, *Lateinische Umgangssprache*, Heidelberg³, 1951, p. 101 f., is not relevant for our place. If *unius* was here only an indefinite article it would be mere padding with no other justification than that of making the hexameter complete. Besides, in Ovid and other classic writers, *unius* normally has its full value of *one single*. So, if an interpretation based upon that meaning makes sense here, it is clearly preferable. I think that this quantitative restriction: Lycaon slaughters one single hostage, by virtue of its obvious "realism" (one is enough — for the dish), is a qualitative intensification of his cruelty. *Unius* occupies the same place in the verse as the — certainly impressive — *semineces* in the following verse, and the specification that one part of the hostage is boiled, another roasted adds new grim details.
64. *Met.* I, 240 ff.
65. We should not forget that Ovid was actually a dramatist, too. We should bear in mind who is speaking to whom; this may sometimes be important or necessary for a sensible appreciation. FRAENKEL (*Ovid*, p. 209, n. 8) has the following comment on the *Lycaon*: "... in its execution it leaves us cold because it is merely grim and unflavored by feeling and humor". This harsh verdict is only possible, I think, because Fraenkel measures the story by his own abstract ideal of Ovidian narrative and does not realize its function as an integral part of the *concilium deorum*. Isolated from its context, the story may be frigid in its display of rhetoric and gruesome cruelty; that means that it should *not* be severed from its context.
66. *Met.* I, 244 f.
67. The term "frame" is perhaps somewhat inadequate as the frame is here as important as the "picture" and as the interrelation between them is fundamentally important to the value of each.
68. *Met.* I, 187 ff.
69. Cp. above p. 72.
70. *Met.* I, 253-261.
71. *Met.* I, 264 ff. WILKINSON, *Ovid Recalled*, p. 433, criticizes Ovid for letting "himself be diverted from the scene by the temptation to play with the personification in a baroque way" and notes that "Vergil himself lapses into similar frigidly when speaking of Atlas, and Ovid may even have had the passage in mind (*Aen.* IV, 250-1):

*Nix umeros infusa legit: tum flumina mento
praecipitant senis et glacie riget horrida
barba*".

That is, of course, a question of taste, and taste is not a constant system of norms. It should be noted that whether or not Ovid is here "at his best" he is certainly more Ovidian here than Vergil was Vergilian in his lines. That Ovid did not follow Vergil's occasional "frigid-ity" by accident seems to appear from the grotesque fusion of person and mountain in *Met.* XI, 157 ff. Ovid's taste may be perverse from different points of view. But one should try to apprehend his art on its own conditions and realize that one's own standards may be more or less irrelevant.

72. A comparison with e.g. VERG. *Aen.* V, 609 f.:

*illa viam celerans per mille coloribus arcum
nulli visa cito decurrit tramite virgo*
brings out the Ovidian point: Iris is not only goddess of the rainbow, not only using it as a road, having it as an attribute or the like. She is the rainbow. Ovid takes the traditional metonymy literally, as it were.

73. A gathering of geographical entities is a bold invention. Callimachus had shown the way: islands form part of Okeanos' court, where Delos is entitled to stand in the first line, CALL. *Hymn. Del.* 16 ff.

74. SEN. *Nat. Quest.* III, 27.

75. As for the relation to HOR. *Carm.* I, 2, 6 ff., cp. above p. 36 and n. 132 to ch. II.

76. SENECA, *loc. cit.*, picks out the line (304):

nat lupus inter oves, fulvos vehit unda leones
and censures it as frivolous. Swimming, he says, is out of place in a flood. Drowning would result immediately. This point of view does not agree too well with Seneca's own description of a gradual rise of the waters. What really bothers Seneca in this line, besides the display of wit in a serious matter, is the almost idyllic picture of enemies swimming side by side. This recalls the golden age — although Ovid has not himself that feature in his *Ages* — where there is peace in the animal kingdom as well (VERG. *Ecl.* IV, 22, cp. HOR. *Epod.*

16, 51). But here peace is not exactly a result of happiness. — Cp. also FRAENKEL, *Ovid*, pp. 172 f. and J.-M. FRÉCAUT, *L'esprit et l'honneur chez Ovid*, Grenoble 1972, pp. 12 ff.

77. During an inundation in cities like Rome one would, of course, not see tigers and boars swimming for their lives, nor wolves or sheep. But what about weasels and mice? Ovid's description is zoologically correct. Wild animals do not chase each other when they are under a common threat.

78. Seneca's criticism is determined by the character of what he is about to write, viz. a physical treatise with an ethical purpose; he cannot allow himself to be amused *deborato orbe terrarum* without forgetting his part and losing his credibility as a philosopher.

79. *Met.* I, 322 f.:

*non illo melior quisquam nec amantior aequi
vir fuit aut illa metuentior ulla deorum.*

80. FRAENKEL, *Ovid*, pp. 209 f., n. 10, rightly interprets the repetitions 325 f. and 361 f. as masterly indications of how closely they are bound together by destiny and affection.

81. The disposition is a repetition of the preceding one: 1) Jupiter and the winds 2) Neptunus and his army 3) Effects on Earth. The passage is shorter and works as a kind of echo, as a variation of the rise of the flood. The military imagery of the lines about Neptunus and the rivers is here carefully varied: in the *Flood* nothing is said about the procedure of summoning the rivers to the meeting; in the *Deucalion and Pyrrha* Triton, the herald of Neptunus, is the predominant character.

82. Therefore the reader is not surprised that natural propagation is, apparently, out of the question.

83. *Met.* I, 365 f. Deucalion is naive, Ovid allows himself to be witty: Deucalion could not know, but the phrase *hominum exempla* would easily make Roman readers think of a kind of menagerie; the Romans were very interested in specimens of rare animals. As for this use of *exemplum*, cp. LUCR. II, 540. — Readers should not forget who is speak-

ing to whom but always bear in mind that Ovid is the writer.

84. E. DOBLHOFER, *Zwei sprechende Namen bei Ovid*, Wiener Studien, N.F. Bd. 2 (1968), pp. 98-102, demonstrates in detail the structural importance of *Met.* I, 390 with the two patronymics *Promethides* and *Epimethis*: Deucalion's and Pyrrha's character is formed in accordance with the etymology of their fathers' names, and this fact determines the narrative of the passage. There is no trace of any such ἡθροποιία elsewhere in the ancient tradition. I might add that it is very characteristic of Ovid to effect a humanization of the heroic mythological world by means of high epic conventions — in this case the use of patronymics.

85. *Met.* I, 397: *sed quid temptare nocebit?* This way of reasoning (in *style indirect libre*) is extremely bourgeois and unheroic.

86. *Met.* I, 407 ff.:

*quae tamen ex illis aliquo pars umida suco
et terrena fuit, versa est in corporis usum;
quod solidum est flectique nequit, mutatur in
ossa,
quae modo vena fuit, sub eodem nomine man-
sit.*

87. And that it is a miracle is underlined by the parenthesis in line 400:

quis hoc credat nisi sit pro teste vetustas?

I quite agree with v. ALBRECHT, *Die Parenthese in Ovids Metamorphosen und ihre dichterische Funktion*, Spudasmata 7, Hildesheim 1963, pp. 213 f., that there is no question about belief or doubt (it would hardly occur to Ovid or to his readers that actual belief was possible); the parenthesis has the function of establishing the psychological basis of an aesthetic appreciation of the wonderful happening, viz. *ein verstehendes Lächeln*. But it might be added that this irony is doubled when the miracle comes out as an almost physically understandable transformation.

88. *Met.* I, 414 f. Cp. above p. 74.

89. FRAENKEL, *Ovid*, p. 77.

90. *Met.* I, 252.

91. Compare the transformation of Atlas, *Met.* IV, 657 ff.

92. *Met.* I, 416-433.

93. The theory is perhaps not so ridiculous as it might seem. Replace moisture by ammonium, water, and other chemicals, fire by solar energy, time by billions of years, and *semina rerum* by proteine — and there is the current modern theory.

94. It seems to me that FRAENKEL, *Ovid*, p. 210 n. 13, a little naively interprets places of the *Metamorphoses* as personal confessions and not as artistic elements.

95. *Met.* I, 434 ff.

96. This seems to be Ovid's innovation. See HAUPT-EHWALD-v. ALBRECHT *ad loc.*

97. This idea helps to keep the impression of chronological movement alive.

98. *Met.* I, 452 f. As observed by FRAENKEL, *Ovid*, p. 208 n. (ii) 5, the conventional motif for an incipient epic was the wrath of a god. Here, it should be noted, the sequence of the words *primus, saevus*, and *ira* may vaguely have recalled the exordium of the *Aeneid*.

99. So FRAENKEL, *Ovid*, p. 78.

100. The two kinds of arrows, one creating, one excluding love, seem to be developed from EUR. *Iph. Aul.* 548. The quarrel between Apollo and Cupid may be an Ovidian addition to the traditional legend.

101. CALL. *Hymn. Dian.* 6 ff. Cp. above p. 20.

102. *Met.* I, 568-587.

103. He is the "geriebene Großstädter, der beim Anblick der ungeordnet über den Nacken fallenden Haare ausruft: wenn sie nun gar frisiert wären" (O. RIBBECK, quoted by HAUPT-EHWALD-v. ALBRECHT, *ad loc.*). Cp. also J.-M. FRÉCAUT, *L'esprit et l'honneur chez Ovide*, Grenoble 1972, p. 247: "Les réflexions de Phoebus admirant Daphné sont analogues à celle d'un connaisseur évaluant les apparus visibles et imaginant les apparus invisibles d'une belle mais peu coquette provinciale, nouvellement arrivée dans la capitale".

104. HAUPT-EHWALD-v. ALBRECHT's observation, *ad loc.*, that Apollo's elaborate speech "passt wenig in die geschilderte Situation" is in a way quite correct. That is the "tragic" irony; it

- does not fit – and it does not work, either. But is it not quite natural that Apollo, a god associated with *cultus* and by no means a common raptor should try every kind of *blanditiæ* before using violence?
105. FRAENKEL, *Ovid*, p. 78, à propos the *Deucalion and Pyrrha*.
106. *Loc. cit.*
107. This *fluminum conventus* is the third variation of the theme *concilium deorum*; where Jupiter acted as president at a “senate-meeting” and Neptunus as commander-in-chief of the rivers, Peneus seems to be a kind of provincial governor of water-deities.
108. Ovid uses this device several times. See HAUPT-EHWALD — v. ALBRECHT *ad* 568.
109. *Met.* I, 588–612.
110. As for the *Daphne* the problem is typical of the hellenistic taste for antiquarian questions; but would any Alexandrian grammatico-poet have cheerfully *invented* the problem himself as Ovid apparently does? As for the *Io* Ovid does not try to conceal the fact that he is writing fiction.
111. I am well aware that this statement might also be reversed to the effect that the differences in the scheme of action show that the characters are different. The two things are interdependent.
112. How different is not this Jupiter from Homer’s Odysseus, whose words to Nausikaa are the model here (*Od.* VI, 149 ff.)!
113. These lines are recalled by II, 848 ff.:
Ille pater rectorque deum, cui dextra trisulcis ignibus armata est, qui nutu concutit orbem.
Both Jupiter’s self-introduction and Ovid’s presentation of him prove the thesis that *non bene conveniunt etc.* Cp. also J.-M. FRÉCAUT, *op. cit.*, p. 103.
114. It is the first time in the *Metamorphoses* Jupiter makes an escape; but cp. *Met.* I, 606: *deprenti totiens . . . furta mariti.*
115. Jupiter seems to learn from this experience: the next times – Callisto (II, 422 ff.), Europa (II, 834 ff.) – he does not commit the error of revealing his identity before he actually holds the girl.
116. The speediness is emphasized by the accumulation of verbs and the dactylism of line 600:
. . . occuluit tenuitque fugam rapuitque pudorem.
117. This cloud also reveals to the reader the real motive behind Jupiter’s invitation to take Io into the woods. He later remembers the embarrassing consequences of having not succeeded in this respect, when, at the sight of Callisto, he exclaims: *Hoc certe furtum coniunx mea nesciet* (*Met.* II, 423). Callisto is already lying in the wood.
118. The phrase *e terra genitam* (*Met.* I, 615) is an intriguing pun: it plays upon two possible meanings: an autochthon – in which case the question of origin is honourably answered – or, as in expressions like *terrae filius*, a creature without any ancestry worth mentioning. – Cp. C. C. Fam. 7, 9, 3 *Cn. Cornelius . . . summo loco natus, terrae filius* and PERS. VI, 57 ff.
119. The dilemma is typical of Alexandrine erotic poetry – and of rhetorical *προγυμνάσματα*.
120. Which is all he has to fear from her, cp. *Met.* II, 424.
121. Her trepidation is illustrated by the dactyls of line 623: *diva metum timuitque Iovem et fuit anxia furti*. Cp. above n. 116. Ovid very frequently repeats an artistic device at short intervals either as an echo or, as here, with a different effect.
122. *Met.* I, 625–638.
123. FRAENKEL’s remarks (*op. cit.* pp. 79 f.) on lines 637 ff. and the confused and divided identity of the cow-girl are fine and penetrating. The Ovidian taste for paradoxes acquires a wider perspective because the poet – very unobtrusively – implies that life is paradoxical.
124. This is much more surprising here than in the *Progne* (*Met.* VI, 571 ff.). There the writing, vaguely referred to as *notae*, is associated with weawing which is an accepted occupation for epic women of her type: the princess or queen. Philomela is a real human girl, not a nymph.
125. HAUPT-EHWALD — v. ALBRECHT refer to VERG. *Aen.*, XII, 879 f.

- (Juturna speaking): *cui mortis adempta est condicio? possem tantos finire dolores*, and there is no doubt that this is the model. That does not mean that the point has the same effect in Vergil and Ovid. In the *Aeneid* Juturna realizes that Turnus is going to die, and in the bitterness of her heart she argues with Jupiter who permits this to happen. Now the immortality he gave her in return for her virginity proves an additional calamity. Inachus was a real god, not of the first order but still immortal by nature. It is as paradoxical for him to think: “I wish I were dead” as it is natural for Juturna to regret that she ever became immortal.
126. It may be significant that Ovid emphasizes that Mercurius is a result of another *furtum*.
127. HOM. *Il.* XXIV, 340 ff., *Od.* V, 44 ff.; cp. *Od.* I, 96 ff., where we find the pattern used about Athene.
128. That is what VERGIL does, cp. *Aen.* IV, 238.
129. Tisiphone’s snakebelt can be compared. She takes it on in *Met.* IV, 483, then goes to Athamas’ palace and completes her mission; having returned to Hades, she takes off her snake again.
130. There is an epic model for this, too: in the beginning of HOM. *Od.* XXIV, where Hermes calls forth the souls of the dead wooers, he has in his hand his wand, described by the formula as sleep-producing or the opposite; but actually he uses it as a goad.
131. Cp. above, p. 78.
132. This seems rather otiose; but Ovid draws attention to the fact that if Mercurius had used the sleep-producing wand in the first place, the story would have come to almost nothing.
133. This instrument has not been mentioned in connection with the specification of his equipment, nor has his reed-pipe; but that kind of pedantry would have ruined the effect of those lines by carrying the joke too far.
134. *Met.* I, 730 ff.
135. WILKINSON, *Ovid Recalled*, p. 149.
136. *Op. cit.*, pp. 152 ff.
137. NICOLSON, *Review of Rex Warner’s Men and Gods* in the Observer, 25 June 1950, quoted by WILKINSON, *op. cit.*, p. 151.
138. As observed by WILKINSON himself in a foot-note, p. 152, Callimachus in Books III and IV stopped connecting his pieces by the device of conversation between himself and the Muses, without replacing it with another frame. This fact seems to indicate how little importance he attributed to continuity as a norm for his work.
139. DIOM. *Art. Gram.* III, ed. KEIL, I, 484, with the Latin translation *divinarum rerum et heroicarum humanarumque comprehensio*.
140. E. ZINN, *Die Dichter des alten Rom und die Anfänge des Weltgedichts*, Antike und Abendland V (1956), pp. 7 ff.
141. WILKINSON, *op. cit.*, p. 155.

Chapter VII, The Minyeides and their Tales.

1. – although it is not true at all.
2. *Ad loc.* and *ad Met.* I, 533.
3. Cp. above p. 33.
4. – and in other arts, too.
5. *Rem.* 382.
6. W. SCHMID in *Anhang* in E. ROHDE, *Der griechische Roman und seine Vorläufer*, 3. Aufl. 1914, p. 610, and A. PAPANIKOLAOU, *Zur Sprache Charitons*, Diss. Köln 1962.
7. As assumed by W. SCHMID, *loc. cit.*, p. 616.
8. B. E. PERRY, *The Ancient Romances*, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1967, p. 172.
9. DIOD. SIC. II, 1 ff.
10. From his point of view the critical distinction between these genres would not have had any importance.
11. WILCKEN, *Archiv für Papyrusforschung und verwandte Gebiete* I (1901), p. 257; B. LAVAGNINI, *Le origini del romanzo Greco*, Pisa 1921, p. 60, n. 60.
12. *Dion.* VI, 339 ff. and XII, 84 f.
13. WESTERMANN, *Mythographi*, p. 384, 21.
14. I imagine that Callimachus would have smiled, had he known how gravely many scholars have interpreted his ἀμάρτυρον οὐδὲν ἀεῖδω.

15. P. HERMANN, *Denkmäler*, Taf. 162.
16. Already HERMANN (*Denkmäler*, Textband, pp. 225 f.) objected to Elwald's rash statement; he will not exclude the possibility that Ovid has influenced the paintings. It was generally believed – by Hermann, too – that Campanian painting was a product of Greek artists and some local imitators (for stylistic reasons Hermann suggests that the two *Pyramus and Thisbe* were perhaps made by a "Lokalmaler"). But even if we grant that the painters were normally Greeks, the dogma that they only took their motifs from Greek sources would lead to absurdities: Are we to believe that a Campanian landlord, if he wanted an Ovidian *Pyramus and Thisbe* on his wall and called a painter to execute it, would have received an answer like this: "I am sorry, sir, I don't paint scenes from Roman literature". To this one might add that in a case where we have two paintings which correspond in all details to an almost contemporary Roman poetical description, whose popularity is known to have been great, and have no trace of any corresponding Alexandrian version, the burden of proof must certainly rest with those who suppose the existence of something unknown. However, recent studies in this field have shown that Campanian painting is a Roman-Italic phenomenon: H. G. BEYEN: *Die Pompeianische Wanddekoration vom zweiten bis zum vierten Stil*, Bd. I, 1938, Bd. II, 1, 1960, C. M. DAWSON: *Romano-Campanian Mythological Landscape-painting*, Yale Classical Studies IX, 1944, and I. PAAR in her typed Vienna dissertation from 1962: *Ovid und die mythologischen Landschaftsbilder der römischen Wandmalerei*. Miss Paar examines seven cases where the same story is found both in Ovid and in Campanian painting and arrives at the conclusion that from the beginning of the so-called third style the Campanian painters started to derive their inspiration from Roman literature, in particular from Ovid and the *Metamorphoses*. The motif of *Pyramus and Thisbe* is not mentioned by Miss Paar, but fits so well into her thesis that it offers additional evidence of its truth.
17. That would not, perhaps, be the only instance in the *Metamorphoses*: there seems to be some kind of relation between the *Herpyllis-fragment* and Ovid's *Ceyx and Alcyone*, cp. F. ZIMMERMANN, *Griechische Roman-Papyri*, Heidelberg 1936, p. 69. – I. CAZZANIGA, *La Saga di Itis*, II (1951), p. 5 ff., analyzes the *Tereus-Progne* complex and arrives at the conclusion that Ovid has given his tale a novellistic character.
18. The combination of error and suicide is found more than once in romances: ACHILLES TATIUS III, 15 f., where Clitophon believes that he sees robbers sacrifice his Leucippe; in the night he goes to the place in order to kill himself over her coffin, makes a suitable speech, raises his sword on high – but is rescued by his friends in the last second; IAMBlichus, in PHOT. 77 a-b, where Sinonis' father believes that his daughter has been killed and hangs himself, after which Soraechus and Rhodanes arrive; the former is hanging himself and the latter stabbing himself when the mistake is cleared up; Chaereas in CHARITON, I, 5, believing that he has accidentally killed Callirhoe, wants to kill himself but is prevented from doing so by his friend Polycharmus. The same thing happens later, VII, 1, when he is told that Callirhoe has been given to Dionysius by the Persian king: he wants to kill himself in front of the palace and spatter the door of the unjust judge with his blood.
19. *Met. IV*, 81 f. and 91 f.
20. In ll. 65 f. we receive very precise information about the provenience of the crack in the wall.
21. The importance of these lines is stressed by the fact that they are "superfluous" and marked out as being so: the root absorbs *Pyramus'* blood and changes the colour of the fruits. They did not have to be sprayed as well.
22. In one sense of the word the *Pyramus and Thisbe* is not a *vulgaris fabula* (IV, 53). In another that is exactly what it is.
23. As for the humorous effect of this apo-

- strophe, see J.-M. FRÉCAUT, *L'esprit et l'humour chez Ovide*, Grenoble 1972, pp. 143 f.
24. *HOM. Od. VIII*, 266 ff.
25. *Met. IV*, 170: *amor Solem: Solis ... amores; 171 f.: Primus ... putatur ... hic vidisse deus: videt hic deus omnia primus* (See M. v. ALBRECHT, *Die Parenthese in Ovids Metamorphosen*, Hildesheim 1964, p. 149); 174: *furta tori furtique locum*.
26. *Met. IV*, 174 ff.: *at illi et mens et quod opus fabrilis dextra tenebat excidit*.
27. *Met. IV*, 187 f.: *atque aliquis de dis non tristibus optat sic fieri turpis*.
28. *Met. IV*, 188 f.: *superi risere diuque haec fuit in toto notissima fabula caelo*.
29. *A.A. II*, 561 ff.
30. R. HEINZE, *Ovids elegische Erzählung*, Ber. d. Sächsischen Akad. d. Wiss., Phil. Hist. Kl. 71 (1919).
31. Ovid very often introduces a short presentation (or only a mentioning) of a person who will take part in the action some scenes later. See TH. DÖSCHER, *Ovidius Narrans* (Diss. Heidelberg 1971), p. 173 ff.
32. *Met. IV*, 233.
33. The last word is true – but yet on the verge of a *suggestio falsi*.
34. At the presentation of the boy's parentage readers who knew their Homer might have noticed that the wishes which Mercurius – for he it is – expressed at the sight of Mars and Venus in Vulcan's bed had eventually been fulfilled.
35. That does not necessarily mean that Ovid found it in an Alexandrian poet; we cannot even be sure that he had read it in an Alexandrian mythographer. There is no trace at all of the legend before Ovid. He may himself have mixed the ingredients: A very young boy (as Hyllus), a siren-like water nymph, the well-known mollifying effect of her fountain, the androgynic nature of Hermaphroditus, and metamorphosis. Originally Hermaphroditus must have been androgynic by nature, not by transformation. The combination with the fountain of Salmacis and the transformation of Hermaphroditus cannot, then, be a local cult legend but must be a literary

- combination. It would not have exceeded a minor Greek poet's imagination to establish a connection between the effeminating fountain and the effeminate boy. And it would certainly not have exceeded Ovid's.
36. TH. DÖSCHER, *op. cit.*, pp. 157 f. demonstrates that the nature of Salmacis' character already appears from the description of her dwelling-place.
37. *Met. IV*, 306 ff.:
"Salmaci, vel iaculum vel pictas sume phae-
tras
et tua cum duris venatibus otia misce".
Nec iaculum sumit nec pietas illa phae-tras
nec sua cum duris venatibus otia miscet.
 As for the repetitions, see J.-M. FRÉCAUT, *op. cit.*, p. 49.
38. J.-M. FRÉCAUT, *op. cit.*, p. 263 advances the view that Aristophanes' theory in Plato's *Symposium* (191 d) about the origin of the two sexes forms part of the background of the *Salmacis and Hermaphroditus*. But Hermaphroditus is certainly not searching τὸ αὐτοῦ σύμβολον in Salmacis.
39. It should be noted that Ovid has, apparently, changed their story: not only has he moved the scene from Orchomenus to Thebes, but he has removed every trace of Hippasos, the child of one of them, and of their killing him in bacchantic frenzy. See EITREM in RE, XV, pp. 2010 ff. The compositional reason for the omission of this mythologically essential element of the legend seems rather obvious.
40. Cp. also M. v. ALBRECHT, *Die Parenthese in Ovids Metamorphosen und ihre dichterische Funktion*, Hildesheim 1964, p. 130: "Besonders häufig erscheint amor in den Parenthesen und Opisthosen des IV. Buches ... Diese Häufung von auf den amor hinweisende Parenthesen in den Erzählungen der Minyastöchter ist gewiss kein Zufall: dem Motiv kommt nicht nur in der Vorstellungswelt dieser Mädchen sondern auch in diesem Teil des Werkes zentrale Bedeutung zu".
41. V. PÖSCHL, *L'arte narrativa di Ovidio nelle Metamorfosi*, Atti del Convegno internazionale Ovidiano, Roma 1959,

- II p. 298: "Ma oscuro è il tono di tutto l'episodio: la notte, la caverna, la leonessa, sangue e morte sono gli elementi che compongono la scena, e il gelso insanguinato è la metamorfosi che ci ricorderà sempre questa storia bella e triste".
42. *Id. ibid.* p. 299.
43. M. v. ALBRECHT, *op. cit.*, p. 130 n. 131: "Allerdings möchte ich dieser aufsteigenden Kurve der äusseren Erfüllung eine absteigende der inneren Beglückung gegenüberstellen: es ist doch sehr die Frage, ob der Hermaphrodit seine Verwandlung als glückhafte Verewigung der Liebe und nicht vielmehr als Fluch empfindet".
44. The narrative pattern is almost the same in the two cases: both Thisbe and Hermaphroditus pray for a metamorphosis in memory of their fate, and both prayers are granted. The paradoxical interrelation between the endings of the two stories may be the *raison d'être* of the mulberry-metamorphosis.
45. There is no actual metamorphosis in the *Pyramus and Thisbe* to balance that of the *Hermaphroditus and Salmacis*. Only in a more philosophical sense, e.g. Pythagorean, can death be termed a metamorphosis.
46. Behind the theory - found in Ehwald's commentary and elsewhere - that these pieces are brought together in the *Metamorphoses* because Ovid happened to read them together in a mythological Handbuch (of which we know nothing), supposed to contain oriental tales, lies the tacit assumption that books in hellenistic times, and especially Roman books, were put together from other books as a kind of patchwork. That does not hold good even for Cicero's philosophical writings. It does not help us to understand the architecture of the Cancellaria in Rome that its stones can be identified as coming from the Colosseum.
47. *Ovid as an Epic Poet*, Ch. V, pp. 128-165.
48. Tiresias is one exception - but he belongs to Thebes; the Minyides are another: they belong "really" to Orchomenus but Ovid makes the reader believe that they are Thebanians. Cp. above n. 39.
49. *Op. cit.*, p. 130 with note 1.
50. *Met.* IV, 571 ff.
51. *Unity in the Diversity of Ovid's Metamorphoses*, The Classical Journal, Vol. 59 (1964), p. 172. Cp. also FRAENKEL, *Ovid*, p. 77 and V. EMELJANOW, *Ovidian Mannerism, An analysis of the Venus and Adonis episode in Met. X, 503-799*, Mnemosyne XXII (1969), p. 71 (*fulvus* in lines 551, 648, and 733).
52. *Met.* IV, 362 ff. VERG. *Aen.* XI, 751 ff. is a model of reading. A comparison is illustrative of Ovid's imitation of Vergil.
53. It seems strange that Miss Norwood should not mention Tisiphone and her snakes.
54. There is a simile with a snake in the description of Perseus' fight: IV, 714: *Utque Iovis praepes, vacuo cum vidit in arvo praebentem Phoebo liventia terga draconem, occupat etc.*
55. *Met.* VII, 149 ff.
56. *Les Mét. d'Ovide et leurs modèles grecs*, Paris 1904, Appendix A.

Chapter VIII, Troy.

1. WILKINSON, *Ovid Recalled*, p. 147 with note. He has repeated his point in the paper "The World of the *Metamorphoses*", *Ovidiana* (HERESCU), pp. 232f.
2. *Ovid as an Epic Poet*, p. 89.
3. As a matter of fact Brooks Otis uses adjectives as "obvious", "unmistakable", "evident", "clear" and their adverbials with a frequency which may reveal some inner doubts.
4. E. MARTINI, *Einleitung zu Ovid*, Brunn etc., 1933, p. 31.
5. M. CRUMP, *The Epyllion from Theocritus to Ovid*, Oxford 1931, pp. 274 ff.
6. *Op. cit.* p. 147 f.
7. RE, s.v. *Ovidius Naso* pp. 1940 f.
8. *Op. cit.*, p. 1942: "Um das Prinzip des durchgängigen historisch-chronologischen Zusammenhangs durchzuführen schmiedete O. sich zunächst aus den geeigneten Elementen der grossen Sagen eine Kette von in irgendeiner Weise ineinandergreifenden Gliedern, um dann

- das, was vereinzelt blieb, da und dort, wo sich Gelegenheit bot, einzusetzen".
9. W. LUDWIG, *Struktur und Einheit der Metamorphosen Ovids*, Berlin 1965, p. 77.
10. *Beobachtungen zum Aufbau der Metamorphosen Ovids*, Diss. Marburg, 1964.
11. *Ovid as an Epic Poet* (1966), p. X.
12. The formulation is not Ovidian. Cp. however, A.A., II, 313: *Si latet ars, prodest.*
13. MICHAEL v. ALBRECHT, *Einführung zur Neuauflage* in G. LAFAYE, *Les Métamorphoses d'Ovide et leurs modèles grecs*, Hildesheim u. New York, 1971, p. X.
14. WILKINSON, *Ovid Recalled*, p. 221.
15. *Op. cit.*, p. 222: "We must remember, that while our interest may fade the nearer he gets Rome, that of his Italian readers would become more intense. To hear legends told of familiar places, and told in literature that has the stamp of immortality is an inspiring thing".
16. *Op. cit.*, p. 226. I have not quoted the rest of Wilkinson's period because this is one of the rather few cases where he himself *nescit quod bene cessit relinquere*.
17. H. FRAENKEL, *Ovid, A Poet between two Worlds*, 1956, pp. 101 f.
18. *Op. cit.*, p. 102.
19. *Op. cit.*, pp. 103 f.
20. OTIS, *Ovid as an Epic Poet*, pp. 279 f.
21. *Ibid.*, p. 305.
22. *Met.* XI, 194-204.
23. *Met.* XI, 85 f.: *Nec satis hoc Baccho est: ipsos quoque deserit agros cumque choro meliore sui vineta Timoli Pactolonque petit.*
24. Midas and Tmolus provide the transition from Bacchus to Apollo.
25. *Met.* XI, 207-210.
26. *Met.* XI, 211 f.
27. For readers who thought that Peleus was not with Hercules and Telamon in Troy that would be the interpretation of the *nam* in line 217. But if somebody believed that Peleus was there, too, the *nam* would work nevertheless: why should Hercules give Telamon's brother a princess; he was already married to a goddess. Both views could be held. The former would be the mythological vulgate. But PINDAR, *frag.* 172 (Schr.) and EUR. *Andr.* 796 ff. have Peleus as a participant in Hercules' expedition. See A. LESKY in RE, s.v. *Peleus*, p. 303.
28. *Met.* XI, 218-220.
29. It should be noted, too, that Roman readers would be familiar with the practice of public *locatio*; there was no need for Ovid to stress the fact that Apollo and Neptunus actually appear in the role of *conductores*.
30. It represents an inversion of the "usual" pattern, "god rapes girl".
31. Ovid combines the Greek versions of the myth: 1) the epic one according to which Themis (or Prometheus) told Jupiter that Thetis' son would surpass his father, after which Jupiter arranged her wedding to Peleus. 2) the popular legend ("Märchen") in which the hero wins the mermaid by wrestling with her after which she stays with him, but only till the birth of their son. 3) the Euripidean version according to which Peleus and Thetis had sexual intercourse only once, in connection with the wrestling. For the evidence of the versions see A. LESKY in RE s.v. *Peleus*. It is impossible to tell whether Ovid himself made this combination or found it in some Hellenistic source. It seems certain, however, that Ovid is responsible for the part played by Proteus. He replaces Themis as a prophet - and as a marine deity it is natural that he speaks to Thetis and not to Jupiter; and Proteus acts as an adviser of Peleus like Eidothea in the *Odyssey* and Cyrene in the *Georgica*, two important models of reading (and writing) in both of which Proteus is the victim; he knows what he is speaking of. In his use of Proteus Ovid followed the sound principle - not easy to apply in a poem like the *Metamorphoses* - of economizing with minor characters. Proteus appears on the gates of the Sui's palace in II, 9 and as an example of transformability in VIII, 730-737.
32. *Met.* XI, 222 f.
33. *Met.* XIV, 855 f.
34. *Met.* XV, 760 f.
35. It seems that it was Ovid himself who combined Peleus with Ceyx.
36. Speaking about his brother's transformation Ceyx significantly inserts the paren-

- thesis *tanta est animi constantia*, which must be understood literally.
37. *Met.* XI, 301-310.
38. Onetor is not mentioned when Peleus left his cattle before going to Ceyx. Ovid invents what he needs when he needs it.
39. *Met.* XI, 382-392.
40. His words in XI, 390 *plena est promissi gratia vestri* show him to be a man of great tact. He saves the situation.
41. *Ad loc.*
42. The importance of the symbolic value of Alcyone's hair also appears from the fact that Ovid resumes the trait at the climax of her pathos, *viz.* line 682 f.: *nec crines solvere curat : scindit.*
43. OTIS, *Ovid as an Epic Poet*, ch. VII. Cp. also the excellent treatment of the story by H. TRÄNKLE, *Elegisches in Ovids Metamorphosen*, Hermes 91, (1963), pp. 465-476, who convincingly demonstrates the need of a revision of Heinze's view of elegiac influence in the *Metamorphoses*.
44. In this he follows HEINZE, *Ovids elegische Erzählung*.
45. OTIS, *op. cit.*, p. 233. In his new Conclusion he has modified this view. The *Ceyx and Alcyone* belongs to "an essentially, but not exclusively amatory world, displayed in episodes that are markedly un-epic in style and basically serious in mood" (p. 352). In the *Ceyx and Alcyone* "the epical elements are set against their human and natural opposites. The epic parody is used to account and relieve an un-epic but serious reality" (p. 366).
46. *Op. cit.*, p. 250.
47. *Met.* XI, 616 f.
48. *Loc. cit.*
49. E. J. BERNBECK, *Beobachtungen zur Darstellungsart in Ovids Metamorphosen*, München 1967, pp. 108 ff.
50. Less disturbing is perhaps the relative clause in 560 f.: *tenet ipse manu, qua sceptrum solebat, fragmina navigii Ceyx*. From one point of view it intensifies the pathos: A king as a poor shipwrecked! But the concept of king is absent from the context, where Ceyx is the devoted husband.
51. *Ann.* I, 2, 51, cp. III, 9, 13.
52. *Met.* XI, 562 f. This reading should be preferred to *sed*. The idea is the same as in 665 f.: *ovaeque nostra, tuum frustra clamantia nomen, implerunt fluctus.*
53. BERNBECK, *op. cit.*, p. 108. J.-M. FRÉCAUT, *L'esprit et l'Amour chez Ovide*, Grenoble 1972, pp. 258 f. polemizes against Bernbeck: "Nous pensons au contraire qu'il était impossible d'évoquer d'une manière plus intense et plus poétique les sursauts d'un homme qui, tout en luttant instinctivement pour survivre, est surtout obsédé par son amour pour une épouse à laquelle il est arraché par le mer et par la mort. Ce n'est assurément pas par référence au réalisme ou à la vision épique qu'il faut juger ce jeu - si l'on veut garder ce terme -, qui cesse d'être grotesque dès qu'on l'envisage dans la perspective d'une éthique de la préciosité".
54. *Id. ibid.*, p. 138.
55. It should be noted that Ovid himself insists on the wilfulness of the transition: *Hos (i.e. Ceyx et Alcyone) aliquis senior iunctim freta lata volantes spectat et ad finem servatos laudat amores ; proximus, aut idem, si fors tulit, "hic quoque" dixit, etc.* Ovid does not let the reader forget that he is the guide and by doing so he masks the carefulness of his composition as if it were nothing but capriciousness.
56. The transitional trick is here, as in I, 583, the absence of a character. In this case the justification for that is the symbolical meaning of the fact that the first thing Hector does in the *Metamorphoses* is to bury a member of his family. That points to the man who was the cause of the fall of Troy.
57. *Met.* II, 760 ff.
58. *Met.* VIII, 796 ff.
59. *Met.* XI, 583 ff.
60. *Met.* XII, 75 f.
61. Note the "tragic" irony of this trait: Cygnus' vanity proves fatal for him.
62. The parenthesis *mirabatur enim* in Cygnus' first reply (XII, 85 ff.) does not add any new information but demonstrates almost plastically Achilles' perplexity.
63. *Met.* XII, 155 f.: *discubere toris proceres et corpora losta carne replent*, to which passages from the *Pythagoras* may be compared.

64. *Met.* XII, 157 f.: *non illos citharae, non illos carmina vocum longave multiformi delectat tibia buxi.*
65. *Met.* XII, 162 f.: *quid enim loqueretur Achilles aut quid apud magnum potius loqueretur Achillem?* On the effect of these lines, cp. also TH. DÖSCHER, *Ovidius Narrans* (Diss. Heidelberg 1971), p. 261: "Unvermutet biegt diese Frage die Gedanken in eine andere Richtung ab, distanziert den Leser durch den ironischen Scherz vom ersten Geschehen des Epos und lässt ihn die handelnden Personen aus einer Perspektive betrachten, die dem Gegenstand nicht angemessen ist und eher zur Komödie passt".
66. Cp. FRAENKEL, *Ovid*, p. 102.
67. *Ibidem*, p. 222, n. 83.
68. LUDWIG, *Struktur und Einheit*, p. 64.
69. Ovid uses all the heroes that Nestor mentions in the *Iliad* (I, 262-268), except Polyphemus who might have been confused with the cyclops. According to LUDWIG (*loc. cit.*) that is the reason why Ovid does not mention him. I think that it is more important that he is replaced by Peleus. Here as elsewhere Ovid is deliberately adapting his source to suit his own purposes.
70. *Met.* XII, 395 ff. On this passage see also J.-M. FRÉCAUT, *op. cit.*, pp. 256 f.
71. OTIS, *Ovid as an Epic Poet*, p. 283, has apparently misunderstood the passage.
72. *HOM. Il.* XI, 689-693.
73. *HOM. Il.* V, 638 ff., where Tlepolemus boasts of his father.
74. LUDWIG, *Struktur und Einheit*, p. 65, takes the *Mors Achilles* together with the preceding half of his Hauptteil, and so his incision falls at XII, 620. As we have seen, it is a characteristic feature of Ovid's poem that the passages in a transition between major movements belong both to the preceding and to the following portion, and this very fact seems to be one of the most important conclusions of the discussion about the composition of the *Metamorphoses*. Otis puts his incision at XII, 512; there is little substantial divergence between him and Ludwig here. Nevertheless I think that the incision at XII, 580 is more important; the *Mors Achilles* and the *Mors Aiacis* are endpieces of the *Armorum Iudicium*.
75. Earlier in his career Ovid had shown his readers how effective it could be to change the point of view when dealing with a wellknown theme, e.g. in Briseis' letter to Achilles (for which see FRAENKEL's excellent treatment, *Ovid*, pp. 43 ff.).
76. SEN. *Rhet. Controv.* II, 2, 8.
77. WILKINSON, *Ovid Recalled*, pp. 228-235.
78. There may have been a literary tradition of contrasting Ulysses' *sapientia* with Ajax' *bellica virtus*. A fragment of ENNIUS' *Annales*, from an invective against Pyrrhus, seems to make it probable (*frag.* VI, 6 (VAHLEN)):
- stolidum genus Aeaecidarum
bellipotentis sunt magis quam sapientipotentis.*
79. W. C. STEPHENS, *Two stoic heroes in the Metamorphoses*, Ovidiana (HERESCUCU), pp. 279 ff., unconvincingly forces a stoic interpretation on the text.
80. *Met.* XIII, 121 f.
81. As witness e.g. his fine point (XIII, 40): *Optima num sumat, quia sumere noluit ulla?* J.-M. FRÉCAUT, *op. cit.*, pp. 32 f. justly remarks that here the play of words "laisse entrevoir . . . une argumentation, une idée profonde, un sentiment sincère". It should be noted that Ulysses' reply to this fine *sententia* (XIII, 284 f.):
- His umeris, his, inquam, umeris ego corpus
Achillis
et simul arma tuli, quae nunc quoque ferre
laboro,*
- while being good and effective, too, is perhaps a little more studied and less impressive.
82. SEN. *Controv.* II, 2, 9-11.
83. WILKINSON, *Ovid Recalled*, p. 235, says that Ovid is striking back at "gnawing Envy" who reproached him in his youth: *Nou me more patrum, dum strenua sustinet aetas, praemia militiae pulverulenta sequi* (*Ann.* I, 15, 3 f.). That may be so. But Ovid, as a matter of fact, also turned his back on the business of a lawyer or politician. As we know him he could not possibly have identified

- himself neither with Ajax nor with Ulysses. Wilkinson ought to have quoted the next couplet, too. It runs: *nec me verbosus leges ediscere nec me ingrato vocem prostituisse foro*.
84. Cp. QUINT. *Inst. Or.* XI, 157 f. with reference to HOM. *Il.* III, 216 ff.
85. Ovid takes over only one line from HOMER's description, viz. *Il.* III, 217: *στάσκειν, ὑπαὶ δὲ ἴδεσκε κατὰ χθονὸς ὄμματα πῆξας*. He leaves out the following lines: *οκῆπτρον δ' οὐτ' ὑπίσω οὔτε προπρηγνὲς ἐνώμα, ἀλλ' ἀστεμφές ἔχεσκεν, ἀϊδρεῖ φωτὶ ἐοικώς· φαίης κε ζάκοτόν τε τιν' ἔμμεναι ἄφρονά τ' αὐτῶς*. Hence the impression he makes is quite different in Ovid. It is no longer one of foolishness but of modesty.
86. Ulysses dexterously manages to conceal the fact that his main line of argumentation: that *ingenium* like his own is better than a fighter's *virtus*, implies that he arrogantly rates himself above an Achilles, too. He even gets away with transferring Ajax' epithet *πόργος* or *ἔρκος* Ἀχαιῶν to Achilles.
87. *Met.* XIII, 135-139.
88. *Met.* XIII, 181 ff.
89. *Met.* XIII, 203.
90. *Met.* XIII, 239 ff.
91. *Met.* XIII, 271 ff.
92. *Met.* XIII, 306.
93. *Met.* XIII, 313 ff.
94. *Met.* XIII, 301.
95. Otis recognizes the ambivalence of Ovid's Ulysses but fails to see that there is a corresponding ambivalence in his Ajax.
96. *Met.* XIII, 382 f.
97. Ajax' words about his sword: *qui . . . cruore saepe Phrygum maduit, domini nunc caede maderit* (XIII, 388 f.) pathetically recall Ulysses' words about his *facundia*: *quae nunc pro domino, pro vobis saepe locuta est* (XIII, 138).
98. *Met.* XIII, 403.
99. *Met.* XIII, 404-407.
100. Perhaps together with the Latin adaptations of Euripides by Ennius and Accius. Polyxena is thinking in a Roman way when she says that she, an *invita hostia* is not going to placate any power at all. Cp. MACROB. III, 5, 8. There

is also in this passage one of Ovid's rare archaisms: *sustollit* (l. 542) Cp. also G. D'ANNA, *La tragedia latina arcaica nelle "Metamorfosi"*, Atti del convegno internaz. Ovidiano, Roma 1959, II, pp. 217-234. For echoes of Vergil in this passage, see R. LAMACCHIA, *Precisazioni di alcuni aspetti dell'epica Ovidiana*, Atene e Roma 14 (1969), p. 5.

101. *Met.* XIII, 408-428.
102. *Met.* XIII, 487.
103. *Met.* XIII, 490 ff.: *lacrimas in vulnera fundit osculaque ore tegit consuetaque pectora plangit canitiemque suam concreto in sanguine verrens plura quidem sed et haec laniato pectore dixit*.
104. SEN. *Controv.* IX, 5.
105. for which Seneca has *pugnat*.
106. *Met.* XIII, 503 ff.
107. *Met.* XIII, 539 f.
108. Note the parallel wording *Met.* VI, 586 ~ XIII, 546.
109. Cp. above p. 71.
110. The parenthesis *facit ira nocentem* (l. 562) is very important for the interpretation of this story.
111. Cp. A. OTTO, *Die Sprichwörter d. Röm.* 1890, 315, 8.
112. *Met.* XIII, 584 f.
113. *Met.* XIII, 620 f.
114. *Met.* XIV, 581 ff.

Chapter IX, Conclusion.

1. *The World of the Metamorphoses*, Ovidiana (HERESCU), pp. 241 ff.
2. This is perhaps a greater achievement than it might look now that it has been accomplished. In itself mythology is extremely boring. Everything depends on how well the stories are told.
3. WILKINSON, *op. cit.*, p. 244: "Ovid can be as allusive as any Alexandrian with regard to stories he only mentions in passing; but the work as a whole would be transparent to the ordinary reader". It should be noted, however, that the point of such learned and allusive passages is to allow the reader to smile at the Alexandrian pedantry. So these passages do not reduce the general readability, but further it.

4. *Op. cit.*, pp. 243 f. Wilkinson polemizes against the commonplace that educated Romans were brought up to be bilingual. But few scholars have believed that even educated Romans knew Greek quite as well as their own language.
5. WILKINSON, *op. cit.*, p. 237, after E. MARTINI, *Ovid u. seine Bedeutung f. die Röm. Poesie*, Ἐπιθόμβιον Swoboda, 1927 p. 190 - the last line of the paper: "Ovid ist - kurz formuliert - der Vollen der ncoterischen Bestrebungen".
6. E. J. BERNBECK, *Beobachtungen zur Darstellungsart in Ovids Metamorphosen*, München 1967 (Zetemata Heft 43), p. 130.
7. *Op. cit.*, p. 131.
8. Seneca himself had a clear feeling that in spite of all ingenuity and fascination this world of declamation was out of contact with real life. In his last preface he addresses his sons with these words: *Quod ultra mihi molesti sitis, non est: interrogate si qua vultis, et sinite me ab istis iuvenilibus studiis ad senectutem meam reverti. Fatebor vobis, iam res taedio est. Prime libenter assilui velut optimam vitae meae partem mihi reducturus; deinde iam me pudet, tanquam diu non seriam rem agam. Hoc habent scholasticorum studia: leviter tacta delectant, contrectata et propius admota fastidio sunt*.
9. SEN. *Ep.* 100, 9.
10. Sextius motivated vegetarianism by reference to the morally degenerating effect of carnal nutrition, Sotion by reference to psychomigration.
11. Cp. also R. COLEMAN, *Structure and Intention in the Metamorphoses*, Cl. Q. n.s. 21 (1971), pp. 461-477, especially p. 473.
12. H. DÖRRIE, *Echo und Narcissus* (*Ovid Met. III, 341-510*). *Psychologische Fiktion in Spiel und Ernst*, Der Altsprachliche Unterricht, X (1967), pp. 54-75, draws attention to the fact that Ovid does not try to give Narcissus a paradigmatic character and refrains from proposing any morale.

CLASSICA ET MEDIAEVALIA · DISSERTATIONES X

CHANGING FORMS

STUDIES IN THE METAMORPHOSES OF OVID

BY

OTTO STEEN DUE

GYLDENDAL
COPENHAGEN 1974