Cupid, Apollo, and Daphne (Ovid, Met. 1. 452 ff.)

W. S. M. Nicoll

The Classical Quarterly, New Series, Vol. 30, No. 1 (1980), 174-182.

Stable URL:
http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0009-8388%281980%292%3A30%3A1%3C174%3ACAAD%28M%3E2.0.CO%3B2-6

The Classical Quarterly is currently published by The Classical Association.

CUPID, APOLLO, AND DAPHNE (OVID, *MET.* 1. 452 ff.)

The general significance of Ovid's *Apollo-Daphne* (*Met.* 1. 452 ff.) within its immediate context seems plain enough. Ovid's technique, as Otis remarks, is to set epic pretensions beside elegiac behaviour and thus to show a struggle between incompatible styles of life and poetry.[1] Yet the episode still poses certain problems. These mainly concern the significance of the story within the wider context of the opening of Ovid's poem. One difficulty is hinted at by Otis himself. He observes that with the *Apollo-Daphne* and *Jupiter-Io* (1. 568 ff.) Ovid has 'deflated his divine prologue'.[2] Yet elsewhere[3] Otis remarks that in one sense the gap between the behaviour of the gods in the *concilium deorum* (1. 163 ff.) and their philandering in the Daphne and Io stories is very slight. If, then, the gods of the *concilium* display 'a modernity, a bourgeois-Roman aspect which is quite incompatible with serious religion, theodicy or poetry'[4] can we say that they are 'deflated' by being shown in the guise of elegiac lovers? Again we might ask why this deflation occurs only after 450 lines. This seems excessively long for a passage which is partly at least intended to be an Aunt Sally soon to be overturned by the lighter tone of the 'Divine Comedy'.[5] Further we should ask why Ovid selected the *Apollo-Daphne* in particular to initiate the 'Divine Comedy' rather than for example – working on the principle of *ab Ioue*[6] – a story involving Jupiter? A lapse of Jupiter from majesty would have been effective at this point in view of the outward signs of dignity which he displayed in the *Lycaon* and the *concilium deorum*. Finally, turning to the details of the *Apollo-Daphne* itself, we should note that no satisfactory answer has yet been given to the old question of the origins of the version given by Ovid. Why, especially, is Apollo's wooing of Daphne dependent upon a quarrel between Cupid and Apollo following the killing of Python? A common view is that the *Apollo-Cupid* is an Ovidian invention.[7] Even those who regard the episode as having some literary antecedents tend to be more interested in the skill with which the transition to the Daphne story is managed.[8] Yet if we fail to see the reason for the linking of the *Apollo-Cupid* and the *Apollo-Daphne* we shall miss their wider significance. It is, therefore, this question which I shall consider first.

Any analysis of the *Apollo-Cupid* must start with the realization that Ovid is here presenting an ingenious variation of a very well-worked motif – the *recusatio* based on the Callimachean theophany of the *Aitia* prologue.[9] Attention has

[1] B. Otis, *Ovid as an Epic Poet* (2nd edn., 1970), pp. 341–2.

[2] Op. cit., p. 108.

[3] Op. cit., p. 358.

[4] Op. cit., p. 357.

[5] We should, in any case, beware of the idea that the 'prologue' has a uniform character. In his 2nd edn. (p. 316) Otis recognizes the unsatisfactory nature of the term 'Creation Epic' which he had applied in his 1st edn. to the sequence from the initial creation to the subsequent re-creation.

[6] At *Met.* 10. 148 Orpheus invokes the *ab Ioue* principle. The recital then begins with a brief account of the Jupiter–Ganymede story. A story involving Apollo (Hyacinthus) this time occupies the *second* place.

[7] e.g. H. Fränkel, *Ovid: A Poet between two Worlds* (1945), p. 79; E. Doblhofer, *Philologus* 104 (1960), 79 ff.

[8] Otis (op. cit., p. 102: cf. also pp. 379 ff.) thinks the Cupid scene is a transposition from Calvus' *Io* but regards the transition itself as an 'obvious jeu d'esprit'.

[9] Call. *Ait.* 1 fr. 1, 21 ff. (Pfeiff.).

E. J. Kenney, *Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc* N.S. 22

previously been drawn to the resemblance between *Met.* 1. 456 and *Am.* 1. 1. 5.[10] It has also been observed that *saeuitia* is an essential characteristic of Cupid at *Am.* 1. 1. 5 and *Met.* 1.453.[11] Yet it does not appear to have been noticed that in the *Apollo–Cupid* we are concerned not with odd reminiscences of *Am.* 1. 1 (let alone of the *Amores* in general) but rather with the sustained reworking of that poem's central motif. Ovid's sophisticated handling of the *recusatio* material in *Am.* 1. 1 is well known. Cupid occupies the role of the Callimachean Apollo and interrupts Ovid's poetic composition. However the familiar admonitory lecture is now delivered by the poet, not the god. Thus the Callimachean motif is, in a sense, reversed. Nevertheless the poet's lecture is patterned on the usual Apolline lecture.[12] Its theme too – each should stick to his own sphere of activity – is an echo of Callimachus' argument that thundering is the business of Zeus, not of poets. A final ironic twist is the example given by the poet to crown his argument – even Apollo's lyre is scarcely safe now (*Am.* 1. 1. 16) – which is a witty allusion to the deity whose presence dominates the whole motif. The poem's effectiveness lies in Ovid's skill in simultaneously paralleling and reversing the Callimachean god–poet relationship. Cupid as the intervening deity corresponds to Callimachus' Apollo. Yet the poet delivers the Callimachean lecture – so he too, in this respect, corresponds to Callimachus' Apollo (while now it is the *ambitiosus* Cupid who corresponds to the familiar over-bold poet figure). Ovid is able to manipulate Callimachus in this way by making use of the two contrasting conventions concerning Apollo. The Callimachean idea of the Apollo who is hostile to epic is set against the idea implicit in, for example, Prop. 2. 1. 3 of the Apollo who is the inspiration of 'serious' poets (whereas elegists are inspired by Amor or their mistresses).

If *Am.* 1. 1 is compared with *Met.* 1. 452 ff. the similarities are striking. We should note first that the comic situation in *Met.* whereby Cupid, the unwarlike Love god, usurps Apollo's traditional bow and arrow while the warrior Apollo takes on the role of the archetypal elegiac lover is merely an expansion of the farcical scene jokingly envisaged at *Am.* 1. 1. 7–8 where Venus takes up Minerva's *arma* while Minerva waves Venus' torch.[13] In addition most of the significant details in the *Am.* 1. 1 theophany have their counterparts in the *Apollo–Cupid*. Ovid's attempt to write of *arma* is answered by Apollo's feat with *fortia arma*. Although the point is not made explicitly in *Am.* 1. 1, it is conventionally the *early* attempts of the poet to write epic which are frustrated.[14] This element in the convention is perhaps brought out in *Met.* by Ovid's insistence that Python's killing was Apollo's first major exploit (441–2 '. . . et numquam

(1976), 46 ff., sees an allusion to this theophany in *Met.* 1. 2. Although it seems to me that there are difficulties in Kenney's view it need only be noted here that the recognition of the *Apollo–Cupid* as a version of the Callimachean theophany does not in itself preclude the possibility of an earlier reference to the motif.

[10] e.g. Ovid, *Met.* 1, ed. A. G. Lee (1953), n. ad loc.

[11] P. Ovidius Naso, *Metamorphosen I–III*, komm. von F. Bömer, (1969), n. ad 453.

[12] The harsh rebuke with which Ovid first addresses Cupid (*Am.* 1. 1. 5) recalls Prop. 3. 3. 15 (the opening words in a theophany). Cf. also Prop. 4. 1. 71.

[13] Apollo himself is paired with Mars in *Am.* 1. 1 because Ovid there wishes to stress that Apollo's true role is as a musician not as a warrior. This pair would clearly not be appropriate in *Met.* Note that the counterbalanced *arma–fax* of Minerva and Venus in *Am.* 1. 1 are perhaps echoed in the *Apollo–Cupid* when Cupid is told to leave *fortia arma* alone and be content to stir up love with his *torch*.

[14] e.g. Virgil, *Ec.* 6. 1–5.

talibus armis/ante nisi in dammis capreisque fugacibus usus').[15] Apollo in *Met.* regards Cupid's archery practice as unwarranted usurpation of his own traditional weapon.[16] So too Ovid professed to regard Cupid's intrusion into the world of poetry as interference in an area which did not concern him. The hectoring tone adopted by Apollo in his lecture to Cupid, the indignant opening question 'quid'que 'tibi, lasciue puer, cum fortibus armis?' and the dominant theme of 'You stick to your business and don't interfere in other people's affairs' all have their parallels in the speech of the would-be epic poet in *Am.* 1. 1. The outcome of the confrontations in *Am.* 1. 1 and *Met.* 1. 452 ff. is, of course, the same. Cupid's arrow forces Apollo to abandon his epic-style arrogance just as the poet had been forced to abandon his attempts at epic.

Yet, similar though the two passages are, the 'theophany' in *Met.* 1. 452 ff. represents an ingenious advance on that of *Am.* 1. 1 in so far as the original straightforward Callimachean god–poet relationship is even further complicated and enriched. Now in place of the poet under Apollo's patronage who can claim that even Apollo's lyre is hardly safe we have Apollo himself whose arrows are taken over by the upstart. In place of poetic themes (*arma* and *uiolenta bella* in *Am.* 1. 1) we have an actual feat of *arma*.[17] In *Met.* too Apollo interrupts Cupid's archery practice – thus apparently reverting to the old Callimachean pattern. The lecture is accordingly once more in the mouth of the intervening deity and Cupid, like the poet figure in the straightforward convention, is accused of attempting what is beyond him. Yet it is plain that the reversion of Apollo to his Callimachean role is apparent rather than real and we are accordingly prepared for his discomfiture with Cupid turning the tables.

The sequence: *Aitia* prologue – *Am.* 1. 1 – *Met.* 1. 452 ff. is crucial and there is no doubt that Ovid intended it to be recognized. We should not, however, overlook the presence in the *Met.* version of conventional theophany elements which do not derive via the intermediate *Am.* 1. 1. The convention hinted at in 441–2 has already been mentioned. Another example of the so-called *primus-motiv* is to be found in the words 'primus amor Phoebi . . .' (452) with which the *Apollo–Cupid* opens. This opening was described by Fränkel as 'casually abrupt'[18] and Due sees it as 'suggesting the grand epic'.[19] However

[15] I do not rule out the possibility that there is also an allusion to *Aen.* 9. 590 ff. (the first exploit of Ascanius as an archer in war) as suggested by A. Primmer, *Wiener Studien* N.F. 10 (1976), 213. Lucan's 'adhuc rudibus . . . sagittis' (5. 80) (of Apollo's exploit) is perhaps derived from Ovid.

[16] Stress is laid on his use of arrows to overcome Python (441 'arcitenens': 443 'exhausta paene pharetra').

[17] These changes are, of course, reminiscent of the normal poetic convention whereby reference is made to the performance of a deed when what is meant is a literary account of such a deed and to the deity presiding over a craft when the human practitioner is meant. Prop. 4. 6. 69–70 is a particularly relevant example of this kind of convention. In Prop. Apollo 'uictor . . . exuit arma' (after Actium) and instead 'citharam . . . poscit' in preparation for peaceful celebrations. In the *Apollo–Cupid* Apollo undergoes, albeit humorously, a somewhat similar transformation. For the connection between the Python episode and Actium see below and nn. 36 and 37.

[18] Op. cit., p. 78.

[19] O. S. Due, *Changing Forms. Studies in the Metamorphoses of Ovid* (1974), p. 112. A. Primmer, op. cit., pp. 210 ff., stresses the 'epic' character of the *Apollo–Cupid* as a whole and includes *primus* in a list of several 'epic' elements. While some such elements might be expected in view of Apollo's epic-style posturing Primmer seems to me to go rather too far in arguing that Ovid has 'epicized' 452–73 'in auffälliger Weise' and that his intention is to make the reader aware of a progression from a 'Homeric' stage (452–73) via Callimachus (474–503) to pastoral-

although it is true that Virgil uses *primus* both in the first line of the *Aeneid* and also at the beginning of certain episodes within the poem (e.g. *Aen.* 7. 647) it seems to me that Ovid is here looking towards elegy rather than epic. While the antecedents of Ovid's use of *primus* here perhaps lie in Hesiod and Callimachus[20] his most obvious precursor is the programmatic Prop. 1. 1. 1 'Cynthia prima . . .'. Prop. 1. 1 has, indeed, several affinities with our passage. Both stress the conventional arrogance of the anti-love figure (*fastus* Prop. 1. 1. 3; *superbus Met.* 1. 454). Both relate a triumph of Amor/Cupid in forcing the victim to abandon his arrogance (even though in Propertius it is Cynthia who captures the poet it is Amor who stands over the prostrate figure). Both show the victim forced into an *unsuccessful* wooing. If we are intended to recall Prop. 1. 1 or some similar example of the motif here then we should surely read Ovid's 'quem non fors ignara dedit' (453) as a joke. Naturally no respectable poetic love affair could be motivated by *fors ignara*. The introduction of the cruel figure of Cupid as a motivating force was a necessity.[21]

If the *Apollo-Cupid* is merely a disguised *recusatio* it becomes clear that Ovid has a programmatic purpose in placing it at this point in the poem.[22] Both Apollo and Daphne have obvious associations with the theme of poetry and Ovid's contemporaries would not miss the humour in the idea that the patron of epic and serious poetry should be obliged to abandon his epic pretensions in order to get his hands on the tree which was the symbol if his own poetic craft.[23] The Apollo who quarrels with Cupid is a conflation of the Callimachean Apollo, the Apollo who inspires 'serious' poetry, the would-be epic poet and the arrogant anti-love figure. He is a type, albeit a complex one.[24] Although his wooing of Daphne is, in one sense, a major episode to which the *Apollo-Cupid* is merely an introduction, the *Apollo-Daphne* can also be seen as a pendant thematically subordinate to the *Apollo-Cupid*. Daphne too is a type.[25] Her counterpart in *Am.* 1. 1

burlesque (504–24). While some of Primmer's 'epic' elements may be admitted they cannot disguise the fact that in the *Apollo-Cupid* Ovid employs the 'Callimachean' *recusatio* as his main vehicle for establishing his position *vis-à-vis* epic convention. Epic parody, in the sense of direct allusions to the *Aeneid* or other epics, is an auxiliary weapon. One should note that an element such as Apollo's *superbia* and Cupid's reaction to it derives from the elegists' conventions about 'epic' pride and its downfall and not directly from any particular passage in epic such as *Aen.* 10. 514 ff.

[20] Hesiod, *Theog.* 24; Call. *Ait.* 1 fr. 1, 21 (Pfeiff.).

[21] The joke is heightened if we see here an allusion to *Aen.* 7. 554 as Primmer (op. cit., p. 212) suggests. While the *arma* used at the outbreak of hostilities between Trojans and Latins were provided by *fors* the *amor* of Apollo had no such random cause.

[22] H. Fränkel (op. cit., p. 78) claimed that the *Apollo-Cupid* was programmatic but failed to establish the link with Callimachus. Neither he nor those who followed him satisfactorily explained how this programme was to be understood. Fränkel believed that Ovid was proclaiming that 'the theme of love was to rank second only to that of metamorphosis'. Due (op. cit., p. 112) sees the *Apollo-Cupid* as illustrating the maxim *omnia uincit Amor.*

[23] The *Pan-Syrinx* (*Met.* 2. 689 ff.) puts Argus to sleep because it is a boring doublet of the *Apollo-Daphne*. One of the repeated elements is precisely the fact that both stories are aetiologies connected with poetry.

[24] The idea of the dignified Apollo being reduced to the role of 'elegiac' lover did not of course originate with Ovid. The Alexandrian version of the story of Apollo and Admetus lends itself to such treatment and Tib. 2. 3. 11 ff. affords a number of parallels to the *Apollo-Daphne*. Cf. esp. Tib. 2. 3. 13–14 and *Met.* 1. 523–4 and Tib. 2. 3. 27 and *Met.* 1. 515–16. See K. F. Smith's note ad Tib. 2. 3. 11 ff.

[25] Otis (op. cit., p. 103) describes her as 'nothing but the determined virgin whose single role is to thwart the infatuated lover'.

has such a secondary role that she is not even mentioned. It is merely assumed that Cupid's arrow causes the poet to fall in love with a harsh mistress. Apollo's plight is typical of that of any victim of *tardus Amor*. The reason why Daphne escapes while Io does not is not simply that Jupiter 'is not a god to put up with a virgin's notions'.[26] Equally relevant is the fact that the programmatic lover conventionally has difficulties with his suit.

An important problem still remains. What is the exact programmatic significance of the 'theophany' motif in relation to the material which precedes it? Why does it occur only after more than 400 lines of preliminary matter? I suspect that a clue may be found again in *Am.* 1. 1. There the theophany was preceded by a clear allusion to the *Aeneid* in the opening word *arma*. In *Met.* too I believe that the opening sequence can be viewed as, in one respect at least, a sustained allusion not just to epic in general or to the *Aeneid* as a whole but precisely to the opening scenes of that poem.

The key is Ovid's version of Virgil's 'statesman simile' (*Aen.* 1. 148 ff.) at *Met.* 1. 200 ff. Virgil's simile stands exactly in the centre of an initial structure (*Aen.* 1. 1–304) which concludes with the Jupiter prophecy and the mission of Mercury to Carthage prior to the narrative of Aeneas' doings in Africa.[27] By placing the simile in this position Virgil accentuates not only its dedicatory importance (since the statesman is, of course, Augustus himself thinly disguised) but also its role as a pivot. The calming of the storm to which it is linked (and of which it is the explanation) marks the end of a sequence of episodes designed to introduce us to the flaws in Aeneas' character and to the disasters caused by the divine forces associated with these flaws. Thus Aeneas shows himself to be incapable of coping with Juno's storm and wishes he had died at Troy. In the sequence following the 'statesman simile' we see the positive side of Aeneas' character – his ability to reassure his comrades after a catastrophe – and also the divine forces associated with this better side of Aeneas, namely Venus and ultimately Jupiter himself. The whole passage is a balance between symbolic storm and symbolic calm pivoting on the central simile. This careful balance is stressed by various devices such as linguistic echoes, parallel argumentation, and parallelism of source material calling attention to the various counterbalanced episodes.[28] In essence the passage sums up the central issue of the *Aeneid* as a whole and forms a kind of extended programme distinct from what follows.

Turning to the *Met.* sequence covering the period to the second creation of man (1. 415) we can see an overall similarity to the Virgilian structure. Ovid is no less concerned with symmetry at the start of his poem than was Virgil. Otis's plan is not quite correct.[29] Ovid has an opening section of 162 lines on the creation of the Universe and the decline of man leading to the ultimate in wickedness – the Giants.[30] This is balanced by 163 lines taking the story from the

[26] Otis, op. cit., p. 105.

[27] On the symbolic contrasts in the opening sequence of the *Aeneid* see V. Pöschl, *The Art of Virgil* (1966), pp. 12 ff., and B. Otis, *Virgil: A Study in civilized Poetry* (1963), pp. 227 ff. Unfortunately although Otis stresses the symmetry here his plan is not quite correct.

[28] The most obvious counterbalanced features are the two 'Homeric' speeches of Aeneas (94–101 and 198–207) and the parallel argumentation of the speech of Juno (39–49) and the latter part of the speech of Venus (242–53). Note that these four elements together with the 'statesman' are regularly spaced within the scheme at about fifty-line intervals.

[29] *Ovid as an Epic Poet*, pp. 93 ff. By subdividing too far Otis obscures the basic 162/163 line balance.

[30] I include the opening four lines within this section. The *Aeneid* too has a

inception of the Flood to the emergence of the new race of men. This scheme seems to be confirmed by the echoing lines which close the two sections:

162 *et* uiol*enta* fuit: scires e sangu*ine nat*os.
415 *et* docum*enta* damus qua simus orig*ine nat*i.

It is notable that each line sums up in the same way the character of the race which has just been created – its nature betrays its origins. This thought is, of course, a key one in *Met.* as a whole so that it is not surprising to find it singled out for this kind of treatment. Between these two sections comes the central *concilium* (163–252) the exact centre of which is 207 'substitit ut clamor pressus grauitate regentis'. This line, therefore, also falls in the exact centre of the whole 415-line structure. It marks, of course, the conclusion of the Ovidian answer to Virgil's 'statesman simile'. It is interesting to note exactly what Ovid is inviting us to set against Virgil's simile. No doubt 'manus impia saeuit' (200) is intended to recall 'saeuitque animis ignobile uulgus' (*Aen.* 1. 149). In Ovid's version, however, the *manus impia* are Caesar's murderers who were unfortunately not quelled before their crime. Therefore no statesman could be said to have put a stop to that act of *furor*. Accordingly Jupiter's *grauitas* (207) which is surely intended to recall the quality characteristic of Virgil's *uir pietate grauis* (*Aen.* 1. 151) is directed not against the *manus impia* but against the *clamor* of the gods themselves. Moreover Ovid cannot resist slipping in at this point the first of several allusions in the poem to the literal meaning of *grauitas*. The din is 'squashed' by the ruler's 'weightiness'.[31] Thus the eminently Augustan virtue of *grauitas* celebrated by Virgil in the symbolic centre of his *Aeneid* programme reappears in the centre of the Ovidian introduction, albeit altered in a way which somewhat undercuts its surface impressiveness. This central passage, therefore, divides the *concilium* scene into two halves each of which is dominated by a speech of Jupiter. In the first speech Jupiter condemns man's wickedness, announces his intention to destroy the whole human race and summarizes the crime of Lycaon without indicating that Lycaon has already been punished. In the second speech Jupiter calms the gods reassuring them that Lycaon has paid for his crime and goes on to describe the crime and its punishment. The section concludes optimistically with Jupiter's promise of a new race created 'origine mira'.

We thus have a ring structure analogous to that of Virgil's opening sequence viz. a 'descending' sequence in which, after the initial creation, man declines and moral wickedness becomes ever more dominant – the climax being the gross impiety of Lycaon who attempted to murder Jupiter himself – leading, after the pivotal passage on the anxiety of the gods and the calming effect of Jupiter's *grauitas*, to an 'ascending' sequence in which vice is punished and piety (Deucalion and Pyrrha) restores the human race.[32]

short initial prologue which, for structural purposes, falls within the 'Junonian' half of the ring complex.

[31] Other examples are *Met.* 9. 270 where Hercules acquires *grauitas* (significantly described as 'augusta') which increases the burden on Atlas' shoulders (273) and *Met.* 15. 693–4 (of the ship which is to take Aesculapius to Rome) 'numinis illa/sensit onus, pressa estque dei grauitate carina' where the stress on *numinis* and *dei* points to the double meaning.

[32] I do not, of course, exclude the possibility that Ovid intends us to regard the Deluge as somewhat rough justice in spite of Jupiter's pleas that it is a last resort (190) and that mankind's guilt is general (240–3).

In *Met.*, therefore, as in *Am.* 1. 1, Ovid makes at the outset a clear allusion to the opening of the *Aeneid*. In *Am.* 1. 1 *arma* represents a false start – the poet does not in the event write epic. Thus the theophany there fulfils its common function of allowing the poet to designate by means of a *recusatio* a rejected type of poetry. Yet the *Met.* 'theophany' can hardly be interpreted as relating to 1–415 in precisely the same way as the *Am.* 1. 1 theophany relates to the opening *arma*. Ovid's promise of a *carmen perpetuum*[33] after all makes it clear that an epic poem – albeit possibly an unusual one – is envisaged. I believe that the only way that this 'Virgilian' opening makes sense is if it is taken at its face value – that is, as Ovid's version of the correct way to open a modern epic poem. The *Met.* opening resembles that of the *Aeneid* in that it is a symmetrical structure with moral good answering moral evil – the whole pivoting on a central scene which derives from Virgil's pivotal 'statesman simile'. Like the *Aeneid* opening too it foreshadows some of the prominent themes to come. Yet at the same time Ovid's structure differs from its counterpart in the *Aeneid* in a number of important respects. We have already seen that the central reference to Jupiter's *grauitas* somewhat lacks Virgilian solemnity. The same could be said of Ovid's description of the home of the gods in Roman topographical terms (168–76). Moreover there is above all the crucial fact that the subject matter – creation, decline of man, regeneration after the Flood – has little to do with the *Aeneid*. Its Virgilian connection is rather with *Ec.* 6 which deals with both the creation of the world and the Flood and is specifically stated by Virgil to be a *carmen deductum*. Going back beyond Virgil we, of course, come to Hesiod the alleged father of the anti-epic Alexandrian poets. Thus *Met.* 1. 1–415 are both reminiscent of the *Aeneid* (i.e. an appropriate beginning for an epic poem) and at the same time lighter and 'Hesiodic' (i.e. suitable as an opening for a *carmen deductum*). This combination of 'epic' and 'anti-epic' surely exactly fulfils Ovid's initial promise in *Met.* 1. 4 of a *carmen* which was to be both *perpetuum* and *deductum*.[34] It is, therefore, impossible that we should imagine that lines 1–415 are, as it were, representative of the type of poetry rejected by means of the 'theophany' *recusatio* in the way that the theme of *arma* (i.e. a poem just like the *Aeneid*) was rejected in *Am.* 1. 1. It is not this part of the prologue which is to be 'deflated'. We must accordingly regard 1–4 as a brief proem announcing the basic theme and character of *Met.* and 5–415 as a more detailed extended programme (just as in the *Aeneid* the sea-storm and its sequel form an extended programme following the brief summary of *Aen.* 1. 1–7).

When, however, we turn to the sequence following 415 it is not difficult to find a passage which can be regarded as a specimen of a poetic style rejected by means of the *Apollo–Cupid recusatio*. The section immediately following – re-creation of animals (416–37) – may be discounted. It can legitimately be viewed as a transitional pendant outside the 'ring' structure but closely connected to it. Although its style and tone are very different from those of the Deucalion story

[33] Met. 1. 4. On *perpetuum carmen* much has been written. See esp. H. Herter, *AJP* 69 (1948), 129 ff., and Otis, op. cit., pp. 45 ff. E. J. Kenney (*Ovid*, ed. J. W. Binns (1973), p. 116) observes 'von Albrecht's careful analysis of the surprisingly brief proem shows that Ovid's declared pretensions are those of an epic poet.' See M. von Albrecht. *RhMus* 104 (1961), 269 ff.

[34] I accept the view of C. D. Gilbert (*CQ* N.S. 26 (1976), 111–2) and Kenney (*Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.* N.S. 22 (1976), 51–2) that *deducite* in 1.4 alludes to the special meaning which *deductum* bears in *Ec.* 6. 5.

it seems clear that Ovid is here reverting to the quasi-Lucretian style which characterized his account of the original creation from Chaos. Thus the re-creation of animals rounds off the creation exordium. At 438, however, the Python story begins. This is manifestly different again in character and I believe it is this episode which we must regard as exemplifying the kind of poetry which Ovid spurns. It is in fact a specimen of a serious allegorizing epic with no admixture of lighter Callimachean elements. Virgil himself might have written it.

Several features reveal the true nature of the Python episode. We may note first the stress on Python's great size ('tot iugera . . . prementem' 459), the need for an immense number of arrows to destroy him (443, 460) and, above all, his bloated appearance ('tumidum' 460). It is a common convention of Roman poetry that references to great size, smallness, etc. may have stylistic significance even in contexts where there is no overt reference to poetry.[35] We may, therefore, feel that Apollo's feat is tainted by being described in terms which are much too reminiscent of the jargon used by the followers of Callimachus when referring to grand epic. Again the theme of the ridding of mankind of monsters in heroic combat is peculiarly suited to Augustan epic. It was first suggested by Buchheit[36] that we should understand Apollo's victory over Python as symbolizing Augustus' victory at Actium. This suggestion appears to be confirmed by the evidence of a bowl from Annecy inscribed 'Octauius Caesar Actius' illustrating Apollo's victories over Python and the Giants.[37] Further support is provided by Claud. *in Ruf.* 1 praef. 1 ff. where Rufinus is represented as a 'second Python' destroyed by the new Apollo, Stilicho.[38] Thus in *Met.* Apollo is not only the god of poetry – he is also Apollo of Actium and the Python story symbolizes his victory over the powers of evil. The defeat of Python thus resembles Virgil's account of Hercules' victory over Cacus (*Aen.* 8. 184 ff.) – a victory which was commemorated by future generations just as the Pythian games commemorate Apollo's achievement. We can accordingly see the Python story as a theme highly appropriate to a serious poem on Augustus' military exploits – a subject commonly politely declined by the would-be Callimachean. Propertius (4. 6. 33 ff.) brings out both the purely epic and the Augustan nature of the story when he likens Apollo's appearance at Actium not only to his appearance when he overcame Python but also to his appearance at the opening of the *Iliad* when his arrows destroyed much of the Greek army. This linking of the Python-killing with a famous Homeric scene and Augustus' great victory suggests that it would not perhaps be entirely suitable subject matter for a *carmen deductum*.

One final point may be made concerning the position of the Python story between the creation narrative and the 'Divine Comedy'. Otis,[39] following Ludwig, remarks that Augustan readers were familiar with the Hesiodic combination of Creation from Chaos followed by divine amours as is shown by the Song of Clymene (Virg. *Geo.* 4. 345 ff.) and that *Ec.* 6 attests the combination of Creation and amatory epyllia. It therefore seems possible that the insertion of the Python story at this point might have been recognized as breaking a familiar

[35] On this practice see J. C. Bramble, *Persius and the Programmatic Satire* (1974), pp. 156 ff.

[36] *Hermes* 94 (1966), 90 ff.

[37] See H. P. Syndikus, *Die Lyrik des Horaz: eine Interpretation der Oden* (1972–3), 2. 70. I owe this reference to Dr J. Y. Nadeau.

[38] See H. L. Levy's commentary ad loc. I owe this reference to Mr A. B. E. Hood.

[39] Op. cit., p. 311 and ref. ad loc.

sequence – a kind of deliberate error in the form of a departure from the Hesiodic scheme into the realm of high epic which was then corrected by the *recusatio* motif. In support of this argument a further parallel may be cited. At *A.A.* 2. 467 ff. Ovid interrupts his advice to the lover on how to calm his mistress's tantrums to give a brief account of the creation of the world from Chaos. His purpose is to show that love is universal and was the force which broke down the initial savagery of the human race. It is, therefore, the only cure for an *irata amica*. This 'quasi-Lucretian' passage[40] is interrupted by a divine epiphany in which Apollo addresses Ovid himself (493 ff.) instructing him to take his pupils to study the Delphic motto 'Know thyself' since only by knowing himself can the lover hope to succeed. The similarities between this passage and the opening of *Met.* are striking. Each opens with a creation from Chaos owing much to Lucretius. The *Ars* then continues directly with a theophany, whereas in *Met.* the sequence of creation – 'theophany' is broken only by the Python episode. In the *Ars* theophany Ovid makes fun of a famous Apolline institution, the Delphic motto, interpreting it as having erotic significance. In the *Met.* 'theophany' a famous Apolline symbol, the laurel, is under attack and Ovid demonstrates that it has its origins in an amatory escapade. The main thematic difference between the two passages is, therefore, the insertion of the Python story into the *Met.* sequence. The reason for the difference is obvious. In the *Ars* Apollo appears decked out with laurel in his role as *uates* (495–6). He speaks, therefore, as an expert on the subject under discussion. In *Met.*, however, when Apollo first appears he is not yet associated with the laurel and he only embarks on the wooing of Daphne which will lead to this association after receiving a sharp lesson from Cupid. The Python episode can be humorously seen as a grandiose false start by the inexperienced god of poetry. For Ovid in *Met.* the pompous allegory of the victory over Python is not something to be admired – or at any rate it is not a form of poetry he wishes to adopt himself. Although at *Trist.* 3. 1. 42 Ovid can suggest that the laurel at Augustus' door symbolizes the favour of Actian Apollo he studiously avoids connecting the laurel with Actium in *Met.* Here it is not the triumphal significance of the laurel which is of primary concern to Ovid but its poetic significance, and as a poetic symbol Ovid prefers to connect it with the un-epic wooing of Daphne rather than the high epic tone of the Python story.

Thus the initial paradox of the *carmen perpetuum* which is also *deductum* is elaborated and to some extent clarified. An opening structurally reminiscent of the *Aeneid* but dealing with themes which Virgil himself had included in a *carmen deductum* is followed by an episode in which high epic momentarily asserts itself at the expense of Callimachean doctrine. Who better to redress the balance than Cupid, the deity who had guided Ovid's poetic efforts so successfully in the past? The light-hearted tone thus established is then continued well beyond the conclusion of the *Apollo–Daphne* itself.[41]

University of Edinburgh W. S. M. NICOLL

[40] On this passage see N. Rudd, *Lines of Enquiry* (1976), pp. 28–9.

[41] Hence the contrast between the Jupiter who transforms Lycaon and the Jupiter who woos Io and Callisto. D. A. Little is wrong to complain that 'there has been nothing in the *Met.* to prepare us for this characterization' (sc. the playboy Jupiter) (*The Structural Character of Ovid's Met.* (1972), p. 49).