GRAZER BEITRÄGE

ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR DIE KLASSISCHE ALTERTUMSWISSENSCHAFT

hrsg. von

Franz Stoessl, Eugen Dönt, Gerhard Petersmann

BAND 7 – 1978

Universität Graz
Institut für klassische Philologie
Universitätsplatz 3
A-8010 Graz
Austria/Österreich

Verlag
F. Berger u. Söhne OHG
Wiener Str. 21
A-3580 Horn
Austria/Österreich

256. Er mußte sozusagen zwar nicht den Prinzipat, wohl aber den Prinzeps (in Persönlichkeit und Haltung) möglichst hoch hinaufdatieren. Lag darin vielleicht überhaupt politisch der letzte Zweck der Selbstbiographie?

257. Daß dies Augustus nicht gelungen ist, steht auf einem anderen Blatt.

258. Nach Nikolaos zu schließen, dürfte Augustus tatsächlich nicht eine Erzählung (etwa geschlossen über die Zeit seiner Abwesenheit von Rom), sondern formal einen Exkurs (anläßlich der Nachricht von der Ermordung oder anläßlich seiner Ankunft in Rom) geboten haben. Das gab ihm literarisch eher die Freiheit des Umstellens und Raffens, ja des Gestaltens und "Anordnens" schlechthin, und gab ihm auch die kostbare Freiheit des Weglassens (vgl. oben S. 120f.). Daß Nikolaos sich insofern (vermutlich aber mit Variationen) auch literarisch der Komposition des Augustus anschloß, ist gut vorstellbar; ja die Grundlinien der Komposition und das Konzept dieses Exkurses sind politisch-propagandistisch so vortrefflich, daß sie mir in der Tat eher auf Augustus als auf Nikolaos zu deuten scheinen.

259. Sehr geschickt wurde hier anscheinend eine kurze, gedrängte Darstellung der einschlägigen Fakten aus der ganzen Regierungszeit unter dem Thema "Vorwände und Motive der Mörder" zusammengefaßt, also mehr geboten als nur eine Erwähnung des Mordes. So war ein guter Anlaß zu dem geschaffen, was Augustus behandelt wissen wollte. Andererseits scheint es ihm nur um diese Frage, die Frage des Königtums und der Autokratie, gegangen zu sein, denn die sonstige Verwaltungs- und Regierungstätigkeit scheint er nicht hereingenommen zu haben. Das war auch besser so.

260. Es mochte ihm sehr wohl notwendig scheinen, seine Ablehnung dieser Idee möglichst deutlich zu machen. Für sein innenpolitisches Werk war nichts gefährlicher, als wenn Freund oder Feind ihm Absichten zuschrieb, die über den erreichten Prinzipat wesentlich hinausgingen. Daß er wirklich dabei haltmachen würde, konnte die breitere Öffentlichkeit ja damals noch nicht wissen.

261. So etwa wohl, falls er das Sitzenbleiben vor dem Senat gebracht haben sollte, was mir durchaus wahrscheinlich vorkommt (vgl. Anm. 196).

262. Blumenthal, Wien. Stud. 36, 1914 S. 102 bemerkt mit Recht im Monumentum Ancyranum eine ganz leis geäußerte Reserve gegenüber der Regierungspraxis Caesars. Wenn Blumenthal freilich meint, in der Selbstbiographie werde solches gefehlt haben, so leuchtet das nicht ein. Wenn irgendjemand, so wußte Augustus selbst es ganz klar, daß er im Jahre 27 v. Chr. einen sehr anderen Kurs als Caesar eingeschlagen hatte. Und er wußte ganz genau, wieviel ihm darauf ankam, nicht mit Caesar verwechselt zu werden: man erinnere sich seiner affektbetonten Ablehnung der Dictatur.

263. Wir können sie in ihren Grundzügen noch gut genug erkennen: propagandistisch meisterhaft, kühl, diplomatisch und sicher auch wortgeschickt, ungreifbar glatt in den Formulierungen. Jedenfalls ein perfektes Stück "Darstellung", vgl. Anm. 188.

Ref. in back

OVID'S CEPHALUS AND PROCRIS: MYTH AND TRAGEDY*

by Charles Segal – Brown University (USA)

I.

A classical myth, like a prism, separates out the distinctive colors of an age or a poet. Each writer views a myth through his own lenses and distorts or transmits it in accordance with his own peculiar concerns and style. Few myths are as revealing in their transmutation from Greek into Latin as the story of Cephalus and Procris. What in the Greek sources is a lascivious interplay of carefully balanced and symmetrical seductions becomes in Ovid, from whom we have our fullest version, a tale of high pathos and tragic misunderstanding. It is no exaggeration to say that Ovid has lifted the trivial eroticism of the legend, as it was handled in Hellenistic poetry, to the dignity and tragic stature of a noble and doomed love[1].

The outline of the story as it appeared in Ovid's Hellenistic source, probably the Heteroioumena of Nicander, is as follows. Dawn (Eos or Aurora) carries off Cephalus, tries unsuccessfully to seduce him, and then excites his suspicions of Procris' fidelity. He disguises himself, probably with Aurora's help[2], and seduces Procris, who

* A shorter version of this essay was delivered at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill on March 30, 1974, at a colloquium on Latin narrative poetry in honor of Professor Berthe M. Marti.

1. For Ovid's transformation of his sources in this episode see Brooks Otis, Ovid as an Epic Poet² (Cambridge 1970) 176–82, 272, 410–13; Alfred Rohde, De Ovidi arte epica capita duo (Berlin 1929) 30–51, with the review by Hans Herter, Gnomon 9 (1933) 28ff., especially 30–34; Viktor Pöschl, Kephalos und Prokris in Ovids Metamorphosen, Hermes 87 (1959) 328–43. See also U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Phaethon, Hermes 18 (1883) 424–25. For a survey of later versions, visual and literary, see Irving Lavin, Cephalus and Procris: Transformations of an Ovidian Myth, Journ. of the Courtauld and Warburg Inst. 17 (1954) 260–87 and Cephalus and Procris: Underground Transformations, ibid., 366–72.

2. The detail of Aurora's help occurs in Hyginus (189.3). The text of Antoninus Liberalis may have a lacuna at this point (41.1).

thereupon goes off to Crete. There she cures King Minos of a curse upon his manhood and in one version sleeps with him. He presents her with two gifts, an unerring javelin and an infallible hunting dog. Returning to Athens, she disguises herself as a young man and uses the two gifts to seduce Cephalus. Confronted with an even more shameful infidelity than his wife's, Cephalus repents, and the couple is reconciled. Cephalus uses the dog to hunt the destructive fox of Teumessus. The hunt ends with Zeus' metamorphizing both animals into stone. Nicander may have concluded his story at this point, but the accidental death of Procris by Cephalus' javelin in the woods is already established by the fifth century B. C. (Pherecydes, FGrHist 3 F 34).

Ovid's largest single change is the omission of the homosexual seduction. Not revenge, but Cephalus' entreaty and the enduring power of his love bring about Procris' return (Met. 7.747ff.). Ovid's theme is not seduction and counter-seduction, but the failure of trust in a violent and possessive love. The gift of dog and javelin become, therefore, the token of the couple's mutual love and not the sign of weakness and the reminder of divisive experiences[3]. It is the inward quality of the events, the play of emotion between the two principals, that interests Ovid.

Ovid doubtless knew of the Minos episode and the seduction of Cephalus. Lines 687–8 and 749–50 would indicate to his more sophisticated readers that he is fully conscious of his transformation of the traditional myth[4]. The figure of Minos, in fact, remains prominent in the setting of Ovid's tale. His attack on Athens brings Cephalus upon the scene (7.456–516), and his depredations follow immediately upon the end of Cephalus' narrative (8.6ff.). With Minos already in the background it would have been easy for Ovid to insert a brief account of Procris' sojourn with that amorous Cretan. By substituting Diana for Minos as the source of the gifts (7.745-56), Ovid gives the wife an

3. See Pöschl (above, note 1) 342.

4. The question of whether or not Ovid is alluding to the Hellenistic story of Procris' revenge has been much discussed. See Wilamowitz 425; Rohde 45; Herter 33; Pöschl 341–42 with note 1, p. 342 (all in note 1, above); W. S. Anderson, Ovid's Metamorphoses, Books 6–10 (Norman, Okl. 1972) ad 7.687 and 751.

unimpeachable chaperone for her absence in Crete. Here he draws upon another aspect of the mythic tradition, for Diana figures also in Hyginus' version. As early as Callimachus Procris appears as a hunting companion of Artemis; and Pausanias, in his brief allusion to the Procris story, also mentions the goddess[5]. Hence Ovid has chosen or developed an alternative that suited the higher tone of his tale.

Since Ovid makes Cephalus himself the narrator, there is an obvious reason why he should suppress this part of the episode[6]. But Cephalus' silence is not, I think, to be interpreted as a cynical reflection of self-protection or vanity. Had Ovid intended us to see Cephalus in that light, he would have had to be far more explicit. The omission of Procris' revenge is of a piece with Ovid's basic recasting of the myth.

First of all, Ovid has the story told by Cephalus in the first person. Seen through the eyes of the sufferer himself, the tale gains in emotional warmth and intensity[7]. The first-person narrative also gives Ovid ample opportunity to reveal the hero's remorse. For this refocussing of the story on Cephalus' emotional suffering prior to Ovid there is no evidence in the preserved sources. Apollodorus mentions Cephalus' trial at the Areopagus and a sentence of permanent exile; and it may be that the Greek myth, at one stage, was made to center upon the legal aspects of this unintentional homicide[8].

Antoninus Liberalis, who probably reflects Nicander more closely than any of our other sources, stresses the shame (αἰσχύνη) which Procris and then Cephalus feel (41.4, 41.7). One can well imagine the Hellenistic poet expatiating on the woman's sense of betrayed modesty. Apollonius' Medea, Theocritus' Simaetha, or Catullus' Ariadne show how it might have been done. In Ovid, however, Procris' pudor plays a very minor role. True, she flees to the mountains "overwhelmed by shame" (victa pudore, 7.743), but it is the emotions of remorse and regret, not shame, that chiefly color the tale.

This last change also reflects the fact that Ovid has shifted his

5. Callimachus, Hymn to Artemis 109–10; Pausanias 9.19.1.

6. The point was made by Wilamowitz (above, note 1) 425.

7. Pöschl 333 notes the effect of the age of Cephalus and the first person narrative, but does not develop the point.

8. See Apollodorus 3.15.1, ad fin.

center of gravity in this episode from the woman to the man. Procris' suffering gets its due, of course, but the real suffering belongs to the narrator. He is the survivor; in him grief has become articulate. To help us sympathize more fully with Cephalus, Ovid introduces him in the previous episode as a man of dignity, an aged hero who commands our respect (7.494–516, especially 496–97). This characterization of Cephalus is perhaps another reason for ruling out any cynical suspicions of his "editing" the tale to his own credit.

Besides these two major changes – first-person narrative and shift of psychological focus from Procris to Cephalus –, Ovid also makes a major change in the temporal perspective. We cannot be absolutely sure that this change is his own, but there is nothing in the extant Greek or Latin sources to prove otherwise.

The new temporal perspective goes hand-in-hand with the use of first-person narration. Instead of unstable erotic passions, the tale conveys the sense of grief and loss lived out over a whole lifetime. The use of the recollected narrative shows how such an experience has molded all of a man's mature years.

Cephalus begins with tears and grief for "a lost spouse" (dolore coniugis amissae, 688–89) and goes on to speak of the duration of his grief (690–92): "This javelin makes me weep and will long continue to make me weep (flere facit facietque diu), if the fates permit me to live a long life (diu)". In the next lines he wishes that he had "always" (semper) been without the javelin (693). He looks back to an earlier period of felicity (felix dicebar eramque, 698) and reflects wistfully that even now (nunc quoque) he might have been happy (699).

To match this setting of a grief which spans an entire lifetime Ovid has also stressed old age in the tale of Aeacus which frames the Cephalus-Procris story. Aeacus is "slow with the heaviness of old age" (tardus gravitate senili, 478). His three sons, "youths" (iuvenes) in contrast to their father and also in contrast to Cephalus (494), have not seen Cephalus for many years (longo iuvenes post tempore visum), but still recognize him (494–95). Though old, Cephalus "bears even now traces of his old form" (veteris retinens etiamnum pignora formae, 497). The whole passage stresses the long period spanned by Cephalus' life and the elements of change and continuity over the years[9].

9. The temporal perspective is conveyed also through a subtle shift of tenses in the transition between the Aeacus and the Cephalus episodes. From the present-tense narrative of Aeacus' dream (634–57) Ovid moves to the past tenses which describe Cephalus' arrival (659–64) and then returns to the present tense for the setting of the tale (665–691). As Cephalus moves into his narrative proper, the past tenses return with the emphatic and suspenseful perdidit in 693. There is an effective return to the present tense at the end of the first half of Cephalus' narrative: 752–53, 756; see Anderson (above, note 4) ad 752. For this use of shifting tenses to mark off the movements within a narrative see M. von Albrecht, Die Parenthese in Ovids Metamorphosen und ihre dichterische Funktion, Spudasmata 7 (Hildesheim 1964) 52–53, noting the striking effect of extulerat in 7.663.

10. See Pöschl (above, note 1) 334.

The contrast between age and youth in this passage becomes even stronger a hundred lines later when Cephalus actually begins his tale. Ovid gains a fine pathos by juxtaposing the youthful enthusiasm of Phocus (iuvenis Nereïus, 685) against the grief and reluctance of old Cephalus. For the former the javelin is only a beautiful object (formosius, 679) and a wonderful instrument for hunting, which is his great passion (675–76). For the older man the javelin and the hunt have very different associations.

The hunt for the Teumessian fox divides the story of Cephalus into two parts of almost identical length, the early episodes of infidelity and the final act of Procris' accidental death (7.694–758 and 796–862)[10]. This division of the main narrative enhances the sense of the passage of time. It is unlikely that the Hellenistic version distributed the material in this way. Antoninus Liberalis ends his tale with the metamorphosis of the two animals and omits the death of Procris. Apollodorus and Hyginus tell the story of Procris to the end, but neither integrates the Teumessian episode into it. Both of these authors are vague about the interval between the couple's reconciliation and Procris' death.

Cephalus' reflections on the past occur in close conjunction with the hunt for the fox. Just before this hunt he recalls the "sweet years" after Procris' return: dulces concorditer exigit annos (7.752). The word "years" recurs just afterwards as he again indulges in the joy of happy memory (7.797–800):

> iuvat o meminisse beati
> temporis, Aeacida, quo primos rite per annos
> coniuge eram felix, felix erat illa marito

The emphasis on memory, the repetitions of the idea of felicity in beatus and the twice-repeated felix, the expression "first years" (primos per annos), recalling the "sweet years" of 752, closely link the idea of happiness and the sense of time. The adverb rite, "duly," is a small, but important touch underlining Cephalus' awareness of the joy he should have had "in all due course," but lost. This reflection upon a lost happiness in 799, coniuge eram felix, felix erat illa marito, recalls Cephalus' more explicit statement of this mood in the opening lines of his tale (7.698–99):

> hanc mihi iunxit amor: felix dicebar eramque;
> non ita dis visum est aut nunc quoque forsitan essem.

The sharp narrative discontinuity of the hunting story reinforces the themes of memory and regret to suggest a whole stage of Cephalus' life, a period of happy middle years, which he now looks back upon as lost. The effect of the Teumessus episode might be com-

pared to the play of the camera in a film over a distant scene, creating a rapid blur of events and thus suggesting the passage of happy, active years. Simone Viarre, in her book L'image et la pensée dans les Métamorphoses d'Ovide, has called attention to this almost cinematographic quality in the poem. The suggestion of a long period of marital felicity created by the hunting interlude in turn deepens the pathos of the main tale: the years of felicitas have taught Cephalus the full measure of his loss.

The hunting in the Teumessian episode is not, then, just a recurrent motif which binds together the three parts of the tale. It has an important role in the time-scheme of the whole narrative. Hunting belongs to Cephalus' distant youth and his youthful passions – and their disastrous consequences. He numbers himself among the "youth" who joined the hunt (vicina iuventus venimus, 7.765–66), and he recalls his youthful passion for hunting (venatum in silvas iuvenaliter ire solebam, 805). It is the "youthful" (7.685) Phocus' passion for the hunt which leads Cephalus to tell his tale (sum nemorum studiosus, 7.675), and the story thus unfolds against a counterpoint between youth and age, insouciant eagerness and the deeper knowledge of maturity (cf. the emphasis on age also in 7.665).

If we glance once more at the other versions which have come down to us, we appreciate what Ovid has added to the tale. In none of the other versions is there any suggestion of the mental suffering and growth that develop over many years. Ovid is able to explore this inward dimension largely because of the elegant and economical means of careful narrative structure, a new temporal perspective, repetition of significant words like felix, annus, dolor, and the resultant emphasis on memory. In both Pherecydes and Apollodorus the external, practical details of burial or justice follow immediately upon Procris' death:

> "He hits Procris with the javelin and kills her. And summoning Erechtheus he buries her elaborately." (Pherecydes). "Cephalus, in ignorance, throws his javelin and hits and kills Procris. And judged on the Areopagus he is condemned to exile forever" (Apollodorus, 3.15.1).
> "He let fly the unerring javelin and killed his wife, Procris. And from her he had a son, Ardesius, from whom is born Laertes, the father of Ulysses" (Hyginus 189.9–10).

All three of these authors, though they emphasize different aspects of the calamity, agree in stressing the external rather than the

internal dimension of Cephalus' relation to the event: ritual and legality in the case of the Greek authors, family continuity in the case of the Latin. Ovid says nothing either of legal consequences or of progeny. His tale ends with the absolute moment of grief, the two lovers alone, Procris dying in Cephalus' arms, in the middle of the forest, far from family, city, servants. And all this is, in a sense, part of the inner life of the speaker who is reliving the event as he tells it and weeps over it (lacrimans, 7.863).

These distinctive qualities of Ovid's version stand out even more clearly when we compare it with his handling of the tale in the third book of the Ars Amatoria. There Procris, not Cephalus, is the focal point. She serves as the exemplum of too easy credulity. The tale is temporally flat, static. Ovid concentrates on the one moment of rashness, Procris' impetuousness and Cephalus' automatic hunter's reflex action. The temporal staticity is emphasized by the staticity of place. A locus amoenus introduces the story (A. A. 3.687–96), a place of dangerous and ambiguous quiet as such places often are in Ovid[11]. The events of this little tale are all clustered about this one point of space, virtually outside of time. The place itself recurs near the climax as the further stimulant to Procris' fears (A. A. 3.719, 721ff.).

Cephalus' grief is acknowledged in this version too: he is "of sad bosom" and "wretched" (sinu maesto, miser vir, A. A. 3.743, 746). But there is no place here for the temporal extension of this grief, no place to suggest the dimensions of memory and remorse working over many years. The expansive frame of the Metamorphoses' carmen perpetuum enables Ovid to develop a far more complex sense of time by enframing one tale within another and thereby overlapping different chronologies.

The long temporal perspective of the Metamorphoses encourages the mood of memory and nostalgia: iuvat meminisse (7.797); recordor enim (7.813). The painful, yet soothing recollection of lost happiness is wonderfully suited to the elegiac echoes in Cephalus' evocations of conjugal bliss. The use of the imperfect tense as he dwells on Procris' name (ego Procrin amabam; pectore Procris erat, Procris mihi semper in ore, 7.707–8), the brief retrospective savoring of

11. See my Landscape in Ovid's Metamorphoses, Hermes Einzelschriften 23 (Wiesbaden 1969) chap. 1.

beauty in tears (sed nulla tamen formosior illa / esse potest tristi, 7.730–31), the elegiac clichés in the description of the joys of early love (7.798–803) are all of a piece with the temporal perspective and the first-person narrative of loss and regret.

This mood conduces to Cephalus' expurgated version of the myth, "chastened and corrected," as Otis observes, "by his respect for Procris' memory and by his continuing devotion"[12]. It also gives a special intensity to his suffering at the end of the tale. His image of Procris "befouling her scattered clothes with blood and drawing – oh miserable me! – her own gift from the wound" (7.845–46) not only climaxes the story itself, but also gains an added dimension as we see the man who could paint so idealized a picture of their common joy reliving his own guilt. The exercise of memory in Aeacus' secluded chambers (recessus, 7.670) reflects the dominant tone of Cephalus' existence since that determining event. He calls before his eyes, as he has done all these years, the horrible scene of his wife staggering out of the woods trailing the javelin from her wound (cf. tenens in pectore vulnus, 7.842; de vulnere dona trahentem, 846).

The editorial intrusion, me, miserum, at the climax (846), brings us back to the frame and to the narrator's own relation to the events. The remorseful addition, sceleratum, "accursed me," five lines later (850) has the same effect. The phrase vulnera saeva, "cruel wounds" in 749 is something of a cliché. In the Procris episode of the Ars Ovid had already used the same phrase, though in a rather more artificial situation: there he "washed the cruel wounds with his tears" (A. A. 3.744); here he "binds the cruel wounds." Not only is the language of the Metamorphoses less stilted on this point, but the "cruel wounds" take on new meaning when we hear of them spoken by the loving husband who inflicted them. The pathos inherent in the tale itself fuses with the emotional experience of the narrator as he tells it.

Only when Cephalus has completed his tale do we fully realize why he was so reluctant to tell it. The tears at the end take us back directly to the tears at the beginning (7.689–91 and 863). But there are other echoes between beginning and end, and some of these also gain an additional pathos in the light of Cephalus' unfolding remorse.

12. Otis (above, note 1) 180.

The javelin, he says at the beginning, "hits whatever it seeks . . . and flies back, though no one brings it, bloody" (7.683–84). That word "bloody," cruentum, might, if we know the myth already, strike a chilling note on Cephalus' lips. His later narrative, as we have seen, does in fact dwell on the bloodiness of Procris' wound (7.845; cf. cruor 849 and cruentum, 684)[13]. Young Phocus' talk of groves and woods (7.675–76) contrasts, we realize, with the evocations of these words for Cephalus (cf. 805, 809, 819). Phocus' phrase, "slaughter of wild beasts," recurs in Cephalus' own mouth when he introduces the climactic section of his narrative (ferinae caedis 7.675 and 808–9). Phocus finds the javelin "beautiful" (formosum, 7.679), but that word will be Cephalus' epithet for his lost Procris (730). For the careful reader Ovid drops hints of a drama within Cephalus which runs parallel to the more obvious contrast between a young man's curiosity and an older man's sorrow. And that drama is visible in full only when we have come to the end of the episode and reflect upon the correlations between its three major sections.

II.

The framing effects of the carmen perpetuum enable Ovid to create another effect, also new to the tradition, namely the juxtaposition of heroic and erotic narratives. The private world of the Procris-Cephalus story is surrounded by a public, heroic world. Shortly before, Ovid relates the heroic achievements of Theseus (7.433–50), the war between Athens and Minos (7.456ff.) and the resultant political alliances (481ff.). This last sequence of events brings Cephalus, rather abruptly, on the scene (7.490ff.). There follows Aeacus' narrative of the public disaster to Aegina and its happy outcome (7.523–66). From here the narrative moves quickly to Cephalus' story of Procris. After Cephalus' narration the heroic and public framework returns: Aeacus reenters with his "new soldiery" (7.864–65), and Minos resumes his bellicose activities (8.6ff.).

13. In 845, at the end of the tale, however, Ovid has suppressed the magical power of the javelin to "fly back" to its owner by itself. In 846 the javelin has not "flown back," and Procris is "dragging it" from her wound. Commentators have noted the discrepancy. J. Siebelis and F. Polle, P. Ovidii Nasonis Metamorphoses[12] (Leipzig 1882) remark ad loc., "... Doch hat die Schilderung des tragischen Vorganges durch diese Abweichung nur gewonnen."

The Teumessian hunt not only deepens the temporal dimension, as we have seen above, but also forms a brilliant link between heroic and erotic themes. It is the heroic aspect of hunting which motivates the telling of the story (7.675ff.), but the hunt also provides the necessary privacy for the erotic adventures, as it does for erotic episodes elsewhere in the Metamorphoses (e. g. Callisto, 2.409ff., Actaeon 3.143ff., Cyparissus 10.106ff., especially 130–31). Ovid seems to highlight the venatic detail, the nets[14]. It is while Cephalus is "stretching the nets for the horned deer" that Aurora carries him off (7.701). In the Teumessian story the fox's leaping over the net is the sign for Cephalus to intervene with Laelaps (7.767–73). In the tragic hunting episode which ends the story Cephalus goes out into the woods without servants, dogs, or nets because he is "safe with his javelin" (7.806–8). In both cases the confidence and enthusiasm reflected in this detail – the superiority of the magical gift to nets – contrast with the outcome which one of those magical gifts produces. Hence the apparently neutral, remote Teumessian episode not only contrasts erotic and heroic styles, but also holds the violence of the hunt ominously in the background while we wait for the main thread of the story to resume.

In style and content the Teumessian episode also contrasts with the emotional intensity of Cephalus' domestic tragedy. Its opening introduces the brusque change of tone (7.759–61):

> carmina Laiades non intellecta priorum
> solverat ingeniis, et praecipitata iacebat
> immemor ambagum vates obscura suarum.

The story of Oedipus and the Sphinx is the subject of high tragedy far removed from the passion of the story which Cephalus has been telling. The involved word order of 759–61 is well suited to the intellectual subject and at variance with the emotional warmth and directness of Cephalus in his own story. The patronymic Laiades, a rare and perhaps unique appellation for Oedipus[15], stresses the remoteness

14. For hunting nets in connection with love cf. Virg. Ecl. 3.75 and cf. also Ecl. 10.55–57, Lucretius 4.1147ff.

15. See E. J. Bernbeck, Beobachtungen zur Darstellungsart in Ovids Metamorphosen, Zetemata 43 (Munich 1967) p. 47 with note 15.

of the events. The plague at Thebes in the next lines and the resultant destruction (763–64) recall the civic concerns of Aeacus shortly before (523ff.; cf. exitium 527 and 764; pestis 553 and 764).

The tales of Aeacus and Cephalus are foils to one another. Each begins his tale with a lamentation (7.517–19; 7.688–92 and 796–97). Each episode is told in the first person and relies heavily on memory (cf. 7.521 and 797). The first has a happy outcome of which we are reminded at the end of Cephalus' story (novo milite, 7.864–65); the second has a tragic ending. The first has a public focus, the second a private. To sharpen this latter contrast Ovid has Cephalus congratulate Aeacus on the happy outcome of his public fortunes (7.512–13):

> "Immo ita sit," Cephalus, "crescat tua civibus opto / urbs," ait.

The "joy" which Cephalus takes in beholding the youth of Aeacus' city (gaudia, 513) contrasts with the "joy" he has lost in his own private life (gaudia, 796).

The juxtaposition of the two heroes not only heightens the pathos of Cephalus' narrative, but also adds elevation and dignity to his tale. Ovid assures us of his hero's epic status before he allows him to recite his private memoirs.

Ovid takes great pains over the transition from the public to the private narrative, from Cephalus the hero to Cephalus the lover. First there is a new day, introduced with a flourish of Ennian grandiosity: iubar aureus extulerat sol (7.663)[16]. The old king sleeps late: sed adhuc regem sopor altus habebat (667). The epic language (cf. Virgil, Aen. 8.27) only clears the way, with a touch of humor, for non-epic material: first, the old king's somnolence and second and more important Cephalus' love-story. Old Aeacus belongs to the heroic part of the frame. His absence leaves Cephalus an audience of younger men (cf. iuvenis Nereïus, 7.685), naturally more sympathetic and appropriate to a tale of love.

To the change of audience belongs also a change of locale. Instead of the formal reception chambers of the palace where King Aeacus would naturally entertain his distinguished guest (cf. 7.496),

16. Ennius, Annales 92 (Vahlen): simul aureus exoritur sol.

we move, on the young Phocus' invitation, to an inner apartment and a lovely court within (7.670–71):

> Phocus in interius spatium pulchrosque recessus
> Cecropidas ducit.

The new setting, marked by the words interius and recessus, suggests the greater privacy and inwardness of the tale itself[17]. Thus buffered from Aeacus and civic responsibilities we hear of groves and forests and the hunt (cf. 675–76). The shift from an urban to a rustic setting (cf. cives and urbs, 7.512–13) accompanies the shift from the political themes centered upon Aeacus to the personal and erotic themes centered on Cephalus.

These contrasts gain an added dimension from the numerous echoes in Cephalus' tale of the second book of the Aeneid, the story of the fall of Troy:

> silet tactusque dolore
> coniugis amissae lacrimis ita fatur obortis (Met. 7.688–89).
> Conticuere omnes intentique ora tenebant.
> inde toro pater Aeneas sic orsus ab alto:
> "Infandum, regina, iubes renovare dolorem . . .
> . . . quis talia fando
> temperet a lacrimis." (Aen. 2.1.–3, 6–8).

> Procris erat, si forte magis pervenit ad aures
> Orithyia tuas . . . (Met. 7.694–95).
> fando aliquod si forte tuas pervenit ad auris
> Belidae nomen Palamedis . . . (Aen. 2.81–82).
> felix dicebar eramque;
> non ita dis visum est. (Met. 7.698–99).
> cadit et Rhipeus, iustissimus unus
> qui fuit in Teucris et servantissimus aequi
> (dis aliter visum). (Aen. 2.426–28)[18].

Ovid exploits the incongruity between these reminiscences of the fall of a great city and the loss of a happy love. The discrepancy

17. See Pöschl (above, note 1) 328; cf. Circe's pulcher recessus in 14.261.

18. Von Albrecht (above, note 9) 139 also calls attention to the echo of Odyssey 1.234 in Met. 7.699 and Aen. 2.428, another passage which stresses the heroic ethos in its solemn form.

makes for a certain ironical distance since we become more aware thereby of Cephalus' exaggerations and of the literary artificiality of the whole narrative.

Through these epic reflections Ovid calls attention, as he is fond of doing, to the formal devices of his art. But the echoes also lend his tale of personal grief something of the solemnity and weight of epic. Ovid seems to be saying, as he clearly does elsewhere in the Metamorphoses, that the realm of personal emotion has as great a claim to seriousness as epic catastrophe[19].

Virgil's Dido episode was an obvious parallel for Procris' death (cf. 7.749 and Aen. 4.19). Ovid goes a step further, however, in suggesting a juxtaposition of Aeneas' heroic endurance and Cephalus' private loss:

> iuvat o meminisse beati
> temporis, Aeacida, quo primos rite per annos
> coniuge eram felix . . . (Met. 7.797–99).
> forsan et haec olim meminisse iuvabit (Aen. 1.203).

Like Aeneas' doomed city, the doom of Procris' ill-starred love has its solemn fata:

> forsitan addiderim (sic me mea fata trahebant),
> blanditias plures . . . (Met. 7.816–17).
> primusque Thymoetes
> duci intra muros hortatur et arce locari,
> sive dolo seu iam Troiae sic fata ferebant. (Aen. 2.32–34).

Yet the discrepancy between the tragic Virgilian context of the last passage and the amorous context of Cephalus' parenthesis in 816, with the triviality of his next lines about "endearments" (blanditiae, 7.817ff.), show Ovid clearly tongue in cheek about his epic or pseudo-epic diction. It is characteristic of Ovid to take the opportunity to undercut epic seriousness with the claims of personal emotion. He clearly enjoys a light-hearted spoofing of Virgil at his most solemn. But his echoes of the Aeneid also work the other way too: the reflect the depth of suffering which Cephalus feels that his fate has held.

19. See my essay, Ovid's Orpheus and Augustan Ideology, TAPA 103 (1972) 474–94.

Ovid achieves not only a fusion of epic and elegiac tones, but also a blend of lightness and seriousness which is a new achievement for the long hexameter poem in Latin[20].

The first half of the story ends with another famous Virgilian echo. Cephalus, tormented by love for the now absent Procris confesses – rather too smugly for our comfort – that he "could have yielded to a like fault" (potuisse . . . simili succumbere culpae, 7.749). One is tempted to label this line a pathetic and inappropriate echo of Dido confiding to her sister in her great struggle against rising passion for Aeneas (huic uni forsan potui succumbere culpae, Aen. 4.19). Happy and generous, even self-satisfied reconciliation contrasts glaringly with tragic love. Is Ovid here exploiting the Virgilian echo to highlight the self-pity of a character whose loss, however pathetic, does not quite reach the heights of a tragic queen?

The recollection of Dido is less ambiguous at the end when Procris emerges from the thicket, "holding the wound in the middle of her breast" (medio . . . tenens in pectore vulnus, 7.842). The phrase is an unmistakable allusion to Dido's death (Aen. 4.689): "The wound fixed beneath her breast grates" (infixum stridit sub pectore vulnus). The echo is perhaps a way of telling us that his story too has its place in the literary tradition of the great lovers. Though he is often lighthearted and perhaps cynical about the heroic tradition, he can attain that tone of high seriousness when the situation merits it – and what

20. The work of Otis, Herter, Bernbeck, and others has qualified many aspects of Heinze's division between the "elegiac" style of the Fasti and the "epic" tone of the Met.: R. Heinze, Ovids elegische Erzählung, SB Leipzig Phil.-Hist. Klasse, 71 (1919) Heft 7, pp. 1–130, repr. in Vom Geist des Römertums[3] (Darmstadt 1960) 308–403. Heinze leaves the human love stories of the Metamorphoses (including the Procris-Cephalus episode) almost entirely out of account. In fairness to Heinze, however, it should be noted that he was not attempting a full analysis of the style of the Metamorphoses and was more interested in distinguishing the qualities and origins of the elegiac style. At one point (p. 101 of the original publication) he alludes briefly (and without specifically mentioning Ovid) to the fusion of elegiac and epic elements: "Wenn die Annahme richtig ist, daß die elegische Erzählung . . . den ursprünglichen Charakter nur wenig abgeschwächt beibehielt, so liegt auch die andere Annahme sehr nahe, daß die epische Erzählung im Laufe der Zeit immer mehr an sie heranrückte, bis der Unterschied der inneren Form völlig verschwand."

merits it is not the death of a great queen, but the private tragedy of an unstable marriage.

By listing Procris in the preceding book among the daughters of Erechtheus and thus associating her with the love-story of Boreas and Orithyia (6.681ff.), Ovid has laid the foundation for the domestic and erotic emphasis of Cephalus' tale. Not only does Ovid make Procris of "equal beauty" with her sister (6.680), but already here alludes to the theme of marital "felicity" to be developed in book 7: "Of these sisters you, Procris, brought happiness to your husband, Cephalus, descendant of Aeolus" (e quibus Aeolides Cephalus te coniuge felix, Procri, fuit, 6.681–82)[21]. But nothing in this remote and fanciful context leads us to think that we will explore this "felicity" at closer range, nor do we expect to enter so fully into Cephalus' emotions. Here in book 6 it is Procris who is apostrophized. Least of all is there anything to suggest the martial, heroic background for Cephalus' story in 7.

The fusion of styles in the Cephalus episode is neither entirely parody nor entirely serious. On the one hand stand the stock elegiac themes which can be documented verbatim from Catullus and the elegists (including Ovid himself): amor, foedus lecti, dolor, felix, crimen, munus, metus, fides, the fires of love, the tears, and so on. On the other hand stand the Virgilian echoes and the martial framework. The clashes are often deliberately harsh. The heroic and solemn timor of Aeacus' tale (7.604–5, 630–31) is very different from the metus and timor which Cephalus the jealous lover-husband experiences (7.715, 721; cf. 830). This "fear" about Procris' fidelity after his own experience with Aurora is straight out of elegy, and Ovid himself provides a close parallel (Amores 1.4.45–46):

> multa miser timeo, quia feci multa proterve,
> exemplique metu torqueor, ecce, mei.

In the Metamorphoses, however, epic tone does not take over the elegiac, but absorbs it into a complex and highly variegated structure in which different degrees of "seriousness" meet and form new combinations. Rather than cancel one another out, the two kinds of diction, heroic and erotic, produce a tertium quid which is neither epic

21. Note felix in 7.698, 799, 831, 861.

nor elegiac. The poem cuts across conventional genres and deliberately confuses – and fuses – them. The distinction between "epic" and "elegiac" or between "playful" and "serious" becomes irrelevant or problematical.

Cephalus thus becomes a new and typically Ovidian type of hero. His grief and the importance of his emotions are enhanced by his heroic stature. He is twice called "hero" (7.496,863). The latter occasion, however, which is also the closing frame of his tale, indicates the new kind of hero he is, a lacrimans heros (7.863):

> flentibus haec lacrimans heros memorabat . . .[22]

III.

The most revealing counterpoint between the heroic and erotic in Cephalus' tale concerns the divine framework. In the story of Aeacus the divine machinery plays an important role. The disastrous plague results from a jealous goddess' wrath (7.523–24). Aeacus points out the temples (587) and dwells on the fruitless offerings (7.588–89): quis non altaribus illis / irrita tura tulit! Omens, prayers, altars recur throughout his description of the plague's ravages (7.600-1, 603, 615). An oak sacred to Zeus (7.623ff.) and an omen from the heavens mark the turning point (7.629ff.). Offerings and prayers signal the beginning and end of the mysterious and miraculously fulfilled dream (vota, 7.633, 652)[23].

In the case of Cephalus, however, the divine machinery is conspicuous by its absence. The theme of a goddess' wrath is trivialized into the pique of Aurora, who is "angry" at the moment when she sends Cephalus back to Procris (meque illi irata remisit, 7.713). But Aurora herself is not taken seriously. True, she plants the seed of doubt in Cephalus' mind (7.712–13), but it is Cephalus' own meditation on the goddess' words which leads him to his fatal mistrust of his

22. Elsewhere in the Met. the term heros carries the full significance of "hero" with its traditional dignity. Ovid uses it, for example, of Perseus, Jason, Heracles, Meleager, Theseus, Ajax, Odysseus, Aeneas, Diomedes. See Anderson (above, note 4) ad 7.496–97.

23. In 7.587 for instance Aeacus brings before our very eyes the temples where these vota are taken: templa vides, an effect which Bernbeck (above, note 15) 74 describes as "Vergegenwärtigung des Erzählvorgangs."

wife (7.714–15). Ovid develops at length the naturalistic psychological basis of Cephalus' suspicion (7.714–21):

> When I return and go over the goddess' words in my mind there begins to arise fear that my wife had not kept her marriage vows. Her form and age bade me believe in the adultery, but her character (mores) checked that belief. But still I had been absent; but still she from whom I was returning was an example of the (same) fault, and we lovers fear all things. I decide to search out cause for my own grief and to try with gifts her chaste fidelity . . .

Only after these naturalistic details does Ovid add the supernatural, "mythical" element of Aurora's influence (7.721–22):

> Aurora favors this fear and changes my appearance (I seem to have felt the change)[24].

Aurora, in fact, constitutes the lightest part of the whole episode. She fluctuates between the unreality of a natural phenomenon and a thoroughly anthropomorphic jealous woman. Her appearance, described in a dependent cum-clause, is abrupt and unmotivated (7.700–4):

> It was the second month after the marriage rites . . . when, as I was stretching the nets for the horned deer, from the topmost peak of ever-flowering Hymettus the yellowy goddess in the early morning saw me as she dispelled the darkness and snatched me away unwilling.

Aurora has a "yellowish" color and on her appearance "dispels the darkness" (lutea mane videt pulsis Aurora tenebris, 703). Both the fanciful involvement of anthropomorphized powers of nature and the theme of rape link the tale with the equally fantastic tale of the rape of Orithyia by Boreas in the previous book (cf. rapit, 7.704 and raptor, 6.710). Even the theme of rape injects a certain lightness of tone, however, when Cephalus shortly before compares his wife with

24. See Pöschl 336–37 and Herter 32 (both above, note 1). Pöschl's general remark on p. 332 is worth quoting: "Den Ovid hingegen fesselt mehr das Seelendrama als das Märchenhaft-Wunderbare, das natürlich auch zu den Reizen seiner Metamorphosendichtung gehört." See also Anderson (above, note 4) ad 7.721–22.

his sister-in-law by remarking that Procris was "the more worthy of rape" (Procris dignior ipsa, rapi, 7.697). Not even the nostalgia and grief of the bereaved husband justify this odd way of commemorating a beloved wife.

The comparison of Aurora and Procris, each in a tricolon, in Cephalus' ensuing lines (705–8) only emphasizes the incongruity of the divine machinery in this tale of human love. Aurora's charms are utterly fantastic: the fact that she holds the limits of day and night and flies on "nectarous wings" gives a mythical touch even to the beauty of her "rosy countenance," with its Homeric allusion (roseo spectabilis ore, 7.705).

Ovid of course exploits the humorous discrepancy between Aurora's divine foresight (provida mens, 7.712) and female jealousy (711, 713). But the main effect of this passage, and especially of 706–8, is to render the divine machinery more fantastic, self-consciously mythical, and remote. Hence the contrast with the directness of Cephalus' protestation of love for Procris: ego Procrin amabam; / pectore Procris erat, Procris mihi semper in ore (7.707–8).

Ovid's most surprising reduction of the divine machinery is his virtual elimination of metamorphosis. As in Hyginus' version, Ovid has Aurora transform Cephalus so that he can carry out his plan of testing his wife (7.722): immutatque meam (videor sensisse) figuram. This change, however, receives but one line. It is also carefully subordinated to the emotional conflicts in Cephalus in the lines immediately preceding (7.714–22, cited above). What Ovid has in fact done is to interpret the Aurora episode psychologically. Her aid to Cephalus becomes the objectification of his own fear, doubt, and nascent mistrust. It is when he "ponders in himself the goddess' remarks" that his suspicions arise (7.714–15). The anaphora and polysyndeton of 718–19 (sed tamen . . . sed et . . . sed) stress the inner battle and the oscillation of emotion. Lovers fear everything (719), and "Aurora helps this fear" (721). It is only after establishing this close association between Aurora and Cephalus' own "fear" that Ovid permits the metamorphosis – or mini-metamorphosis – of 722.

The metamorphosis which thematically justifies the inclusion of the tale in the poem has virtually nothing to do with the main episode. This is the story of the fox and hound which Ovid has probably taken from Nicander but given a very different place in the totality of his narrative. Were it omitted, we would miss nothing[25].

Of the two gifts which figure in the tale only the one that is actually irrelevant to the story itself involves metamorphosis (the dog).

25. This point is well made by Otis (above, note 1) 182, but perhaps not emphasized as much as it deserves to be.

The javelin, which is indispensable to the unhappy ending, has no metamorphosis associated with it, and at the climax of the story its magical powers are utterly forgotten (cf. 7.846 with 7.684). The absence of the supernatural from the main body of the tale is all the more noticeable because Cephalus' tale is surrounded by stories that are full of supernatural events: the metamorphosis of Tereus and Procne and the rape of Orithyia at the end of book 6, Medea and her witchcraft in 7.185ff., the rapid sequence of metamorphoses in 7.350–401, the story of Arne in 465–68, the deeds of Theseus in 433–50, the Myrmidons just preceding Cephalus' tale and the transformation of Scylla just after it in book 8 (8.142–51).

By concentrating on the human pathos and human motivation, Ovid regains something of the original bareness and simplicity of the myth as it appears in our earliest version, Pherecydes. Ovid has, of course, added a whole inward dimension far beyond what the extant remains suggest for Pherecydes. But for all its fantasy and the convolutions of its structure the myth in Ovid's hands becomes entirely natural and plausible in terms of human relationships and human feelings.

IV.

Along with this naturalness goes a tragic tenor[26]. There is nothing in Ovid's tale to relieve this tragic tone, no miracles, no helpful metamorphoses like those in the stories of Iphis or Pygmalion. Cephalus' entreaty at the end: neu me morte sua sceleratum deserat oro (7.850) is, in fact, an echo of death-scenes in Greek tragedy[27]. Aside from Cephalus' tears the last scene has a tragic austerity too (7.851–62). Ovid makes use of a series of reversals, of which the most effective concerns the javelin, the implement whose presence motivates the story in the first place (7.675ff.). The "gift" (dona) with which Procris "gives herself" back to Cephalus (7.753–54) becomes

26. Otis (above, note 1) seems to me to understress the tragic quality of the tale (pp. 176, 272) in seeking to create an antithesis between the grimness of the Tereus story and the semi-tragedy (272) or near-tragedy of Procris (273). Pöschl (above note 1) 332 describes the episode as "eine Dichtung, die in die Nähe des Tragischen rückt"; cf. also p. 338 and p. 341, note 2.

27. Cf., for example, Euripides, Alcestis 202f., 250, 275; Hippolytus 1456.

the deadly "gift" that she "draws from her wound" (846). What should reunite causes the final and irremediable separation. It is because of the magical power of the javelin that Cephalus goes alone to the woods (7.806–8). This small detail leaves the way open to Procris' suspicion and its result, the disastrous excursion to spy on Cephalus.

The pattern of reversal sketched by the javelin is repeated in a number of other details. Cephalus' refusal of Aurora in the name of his foedera lecti, "the sanctities of his bed" (7.710), is echoed in Procris' dying entreaty (per nostri foedera lecti, 7.852)[28]. The echo affirms the basic fidelity of the couple to one another, but also points up the tragedy of the "mistake of a name," the ἁμαρτία which destroys them (error nominis, 7.857). The mental "wounds" (vulnera) of distrust which Cephalus gives himself (7.738–39) issue into the real "wound" he inflicts on Procris (842, 849). Cephalus' loss of "felicity" (felix, 7.698, 799) is shared by Procris (831), until all felicity is cancelled forever as she "breathes out her unhappy soul" (infelicem animam, 861). His "grief" and "fear" (dolor, metus) at being, he thinks, deceived (7.715, 720) become hers (826, 830, 831). She has her "cruel fate" (iniquum fatum, 828), just as a strange fate leads Cephalus on (sic me mea fata trahebant, 816). Her "wretchedness" in an unfaithful husband (miserrima, 832) becomes his cry of remorse (me miserum, 846). When Procris "hopes to be deceived" (832) and "refuses faith" (fidem, 844), she is in fact proving herself indeed a fida coniunx (843–44); but this very demand for fides, a leitmotif of the tale, destroys the love it would protect. Accused of being perfida (742), Procris is undone by her very virtue as a fida coniunx.

Credula res amor est (7.826): the credulity of love is, in a superficial sense, the moral of the tale, as it is, in far simpler way, in the version of the story told in the Ars (A. A. 3.685–86). But the theme of the credulity of lovers is also part of the tragic symmetry between the two parts of the tale. Procris' generalization on the credulity of love in 826 at the moment when that love begins to become tainted with suspicion echoes the similar generalization of Cephalus at the exact same moment in his story (sed cuncta timemus amantes, 719).

Through this network of parallels and echoes both lovers are drawn together into a pattern of repeated actions and emotions. The same motions are repeated, and both characters are thus made to share a suffering for which both are responsible, yet of which both are also innocent. In both cases the "crime" proves to be "fictitious" (cf. fictus adulter in 7.741 and crimen fictum in 7.824), but the mechanism of doubt and accusation does more harm than an actual infidelity might have.

By relating the catastrophe directly to the main emotional problem between the two lovers, viz. "faith" and "belief," (fides, credere), Ovid shows its roots in their character. Their tragedy, though out of proportion to their fault (and far more so in Procris' case since she treats her suspicions with greater restraint than Cephalus did his)[29], is still a result of their own inner make-up. Their own disposition causes error to explode into disaster. Cephalus bitterly and angrily accuses Procris of being perfida (7.742), but when he discovers the truth of her nature as a fida coniunx it is too late: the "voice of the faithful wife" that he hears is uttering the death-cry (7.842–44):

> Procris erat medioque tenens in pectore vulnus
> "ei mihi!" conclamat. vox est ubi cognita fidae
> coniugis, ad vocem praeceps amensque cucurri.

The tragic quality of Ovid's tale is directly related to its form, that is, to the carefully established symmetry between the situation of the two protagonists. We have already pointed out the recurrent themes of "belief" and "fidelity" (fides, credere) and the parallels in the suspicions entertained between husband and wife. The parallels go even further. Cephalus' "approach" (aditus, 7.726) to Procris as the "false adulterer" (fictus adulter, 741) is answered by the messenger's "approach" (adit, 825) with a "false charge" (crimen fictum, 824). Aurora, the motivating divine machinery, introduces both scenes: we may compare pulsis Aurora tenebris in 703 with postera depulerant Aurorae lumina noctem at the beginning of Procris' fatal distrust in 835[30].

In both cases an outside influence sets the process of suspicion and investigation into motion: Aurora in the case of Cephalus, the "rash informant" (temerarius index) in the case of Procris (714ff. and 821ff.). In both cases this external cause rapidly gives way to the natural play of emotion. By the second half of the story the supernatural motivation, small in any event, is dispensed with entirely. In both cases the emotion of fear (metus, timor) is the opening wedge to

28. For the echo see Anderson (above, note 4) ad 852.

29. See Pöschl (above, note 1) 338–40. Herter (above, note 1) 32 goes too far in making Procris utterly guiltless; and he simplifies the moral complexity and tragedy of the story when he suggests that Cephalus' tragedy can be complete only when his wife has no guilt (34).

30. For the parallels between the two parts of the tale see Anderson (above, note 4) ad 804 and 835.

the wider break between the couple (715, 719, 721; 830). In both cases too "pain" accompanies fear (dolor, 720 and 831). Both lovers hesitate, but finally give in to their doubt (714–19 and 831–34).

The bipartite structure of the narrative suggests a kind of poetic justice behind the actions of the two protagonists. But this symmetry has another, deeper dimension. It suggests the repetition of a self-destructive mechanism, almost the unconscious reenactment of a neurotic pattern. The large time-scale created by the structure of the episode conduces to the same effect, the suggestion of a latent pattern reenacted after many years. The elaborate parallels between the two halves of the story – felicity lost and felicity regained in each part (cf. 698 and 752, 796ff. and 736) – show us an ideal happiness twice renewed and twice disintegrating into cruelty and violence before our eyes, with the violence escalating from emotional pain to actual physical hurt in the second enactment.

Symmetrical also is the weakness on each side. Though Ovid omits the symmetry of each protagonist's surrender to a seducer which was in the Greek sources, he presents (or rather has Cephalus present) sympathetically the malaise, uncertainty, and suspicion which Procris now feels[31]. The premises of this new love are still false to the realities and complexities of human life, the weaknesses of real men and women, the variety and contradictoriness of human emotions. Demanding the impossible, the two lovers, each in his own way, destroy the love itself.

Ovid's critique of this kind of love is also a critique of the literary conventions in which it is usually enshrined. The episode can thus be read, in part, as a kind of criticism of the extreme "romanticism" of the elegiac style. Cephalus' description of the lovers' happiness in 800–803 is a good example:

31. It is interesting that Ariosto, who adapts Ovid's tale (Orlando Furioso 43), including the role of the male first-person narrator, suppresses the woman's side of this symmetry. His emphasis lies primarily on the husband's testing of the wife, as a result of which the wife, ashamed and incensed, abandons her husband for a young knight who had courted her unsuccessfully. The change entirely removes the tragic structure of Ovid's tale and reduces the grief of the narrator to self-pity rather than compassion and remorse for his wife's death. Though Ovid presents the story through the man's eyes, he is remarkably attentive to the woman's point of view.

mutua cura duos et amor socialis habebat,
nec Iovis illa meo thalamos praeferret amori,
nec me quae caperet, non si Venus ipsa veniret,
ulla erat; aequales urebant pectora flammae.

Behind this passage stand the hyperboles of poems like Catullus 45 or 72 or the ideal of the total, unswerving devotion of the perpetuus amor such as Ovid himself extolls in a poem like Amores 1.3.

Such an ideal, the Cephalus-Procris episode suggests, not only is impossible to attain, but overlooks the violence and potential destructiveness contained in the very impulses which create the ideal. By its very nature this type of amor is subject to crises of "belief" and "fear," fides and metus. Such is the tenor of the only two general statements about love in the episode:

sed cuncta timemus amantes (719)
credula res amor est (826).

Cephalus' behavior in the first half of the story in fact implies that this amor even requires and feeds upon such crises in order to assure itself of its intensity and reality[32]. It is not a steady and enduring love, but "a violent fire" – also an elegiac cliché – which prevents Cephalus from being able to let Procris go (747–48). Hence the "equal burning" of both lovers in the second half of the episode (803) will carry associations not only of blissful union, but of violence as well. They feel "mutual concern," mutua cura, but cura is also an elegiac commonplace for the "anxiety" of love, and no love lived on a day-to-day basis can survive that for very long. Procris is "free of anxiety," secura, only when the turbulence of this love is terminated in death: sed vultu meliore mori secura videtur (862). Amor is, as Procris says in her last breath, the "cause of her death" (causam mihi mortis amorem, 855), but it is an "enduring love," manentem amorem (854), only when projected into a future from which she will be absent (cum pereo, 855). Her very last line shows their relation gripped by possessiveness and jealousy to the last (856):

ne thalamis Auram patiare innubere nostris.

32. Pöschl (above, note 1) 338–39 gives a fine analysis of Cephalus' behavior.

V.

Ovid's narrative, however, goes far beyond the demonstration that the elegiac ideal has no place in the realities of a long-lasting marriage. The reenactment of the mechanism of suspicion and alienation between the two lovers gives both psychological continuity and a tragic depth to the tale. Here again the perspective of time is especially important. Those years lived "in concord" (752, 797ff.) should have taught them something. In fact, Procris shows more maturity than Cephalus did years ago. After her initial breakdown with grief and hurt (subito conlapsa dolore, 826), she hesitates (832) and refuses to believe the messenger's report of his infidelity (833–34). Rather than leap to conclusions, she goes out to investigate. Her painful, but restrained inner suffering (827–31) differs radically from the wild bacchantic passion in which Ovid permits her to indulge in the version told in the Ars (A. A. 3. 707–10). Like Cephalus earlier, she demands autopsy (833), but she does not attempt anything like Cephalus' elaborate frame-up. So there has been progress. The years seem to have brought something. But the point is that they have not brought enough. The messenger's news activates the old mechanism of dolor, metus, crimen (826–30). Even though Procris is admirably restrained in making accusations (at least by comparison with Cephalus earlier), she has to bear the brunt of the self-destructive force which this love contains.

The familiar and ancient theme of the vulnus amoris, the "wound of love," enables Ovid to bring together the erotic and destructive dimensions of this kind of love. The tale ends with the wife wounded by the husband's spear, wounded not in the erotic sense that would consummate their love, but in a grimly literal sense which terminates it.

The spear which inflicts the wound was itself a token of reconciliation and also therefore a reminder of the imperfections and vicissitudes of this love. In wounding her with it, Cephalus reenacts in physical terms the self-destructiveness of their earlier love. Then he "fought for his own wound" (non sum contentus et in mea / pugno vulnera, 738–39). Now the physical wound in Procris' breast only completes the emotional wound, the dolor caused by suspicion and

distrust. Those metaphorical "wounds" inflicted by the self-torment of a lover who cannot find peace in his love become, as in the case of Virgil's Dido, the literal "wounds" with which he finally kills the love-object (842, 846, 849)[33].

The image of Procris "drawing her gift from the wound" (sua de vulnere dona trahentem, 846) recapitulates the course of the love-affair and the perverse need of the two lovers each to hurt himself and the other, to experience and inflict dolor. The "gift" of the spear was part of Procris' "gift of herself" (tamquam se parva dedisset dona, 753–54). It ushers in a period of apparent concord and felicity (752, 796–803). But the use of the "gift" at the end not only destroys the happiness, but destroys it in a way which suggests that the self-destructiveness of this relationship still continues. Procris half believes the servant; Cephalus utters his equivocal blandishments to "Aura" (838–39). In a sudden irrational impulse the old destructiveness flares up again, but with a violence all the greater for the years of its suppression. "Gift" and "wound" reveal their true implications, and their destructive power is blown up to gigantic, nightmare-like dimensions.

There is a certain mystery surrounding the impulse which leads Cephalus to use "ambiguous words" (vocibus ambiguis, 821) in his address to the wind (814–20):

> meque iuves intresque sinus, gratissima, nostros,
> utque facis, relevare velis, quibus urimur, aestus,
> forsitan addiderim (sic me mea fata trahebant),
> blanditias plures et "tu mihi magna voluptas"
> dicere sim solitus, "tu me reficisque fovesque,
> tu facis ut silvas, ut amem loca sola: meoque
> spiritus iste tuus semper captatur ab ore."

The erotic language of the second line is especially striking because fire is used shortly before to signify the flames of passion (cf. 747–48, 803). One does not usually address the wind in such terms. Ovid underlines this strange quirk of Cephalus by having him persist in it at the decisive moment of Procris' appearance (837–39):

33. Cf. the fusion of the literal and figurative "wound of love" in the Procris passage of the Ars, 3.736–38, where the tragic quality of the metaphor in the Met. is replaced by the artificiality of a literary conceit.

aura veni, dixi, nostroque medere labori.
sed subito gemitus inter mea verba videbar
nescio quos audisse; veni, tamen, optima, dixi.

Ovid is probably exploiting the sensuous connotations which can attach to these sylvan settings, so often the scene of lust or rape[34]. We have already called attention to this kind of locus amoenus in the Procris episode of the Ars (A. A. 3.687–696). Such associations, however, though they may add a certain vague erotic overtone, hardly form a sufficient explanation.

The only explanation Ovid does offer is the parenthesis of 816, sic me mea fata trahebant, "Thus did my fates draw me along." A perverse and obscure tragic destiny dogs the finally attained felicity of the hero.

The line, as we have noted above, echoes the description of the fall of Troy in Aeneid 2.34: seu iam Troiae sic fata ferebant. Ovid's imitation tacitly juxtaposes things great and small. In both cases a hostile power guides human life unaccountably to ruin. Ovid had used a similar expression of Actaeon's fate: sic illum fata ferebant (3.176), an episode which explicitly calls into question the justice of the gods (3.253–55). Fata in Ovid can sometimes denote a stable and rational governance of the world, a law which even Jupiter must obey (cf. 9.427–38, especially 434), a directing force which guides history to its fulfilment in the rule of Augustus[35]. But these fata can also be perverse, destructive, uncanny (e. g. 9.336, 9.359). In the story of Arachne in the previous book the fata are identified with the flaw of character which leads to wrongdoing and disaster (6.50–51):

perstat in incepto, stolidaeque cupidine palmae/in sua fata ruit.

Nothing in the Cephalus episode, however, allows of so clear a moral interpretation. The tradition furnished some precedent for the intrusion of a mysterious, irrational element: Pherecydes has Cephalus suddenly go berserk at the sight of Procris and kill her with the javelin which he happens to have at hand[36]. Yet this outbreak of homicidal madness is still not on the same level as the persistent address to Aura by Ovid's Cephalus.

Possibly Cephalus' ambiguous invocations to Aura can be understood as the continuation within him of an unstable and negative erotic trait parallel to the persistence of jealousy and suspicion be-

34. See above, note 11; also Hugh Parry, Ovid's Metamorphoses: Violence in a Pastoral Landscape, TAPA 95 (1964) 268–82.

35. Cf. Met. 13.623f. and 15.799, 807; cf. also Von Albrecht (above, note 9) p. 99, note 72 and p. 141 with note 151.

36. Pherecydes, FGrHist 3. F 34, lines 13–14.

tween him and Procris. But there is nothing in the text that really supports such a view, and we must regard Cephalus' appeal to his fata as an instance of that apparently amoral violence of the world of the Metamorphoses, a violence which often makes mortals helpless victims of remote divine powers. In this case, however, that violence also has some basis within the character itself. It acts to destroy what Cephalus most deeply loves. A similar "fate" for Procris seems to parallel the fata of Cephalus. At the news of the informant she calls herself accursed by an "evil fate" (se fati dixit iniqui, 828).

The unhappy fata in these two passages are all the more noteworthy because Ovid has reduced the divine machinery elsewhere in the tale. Even in the metamorphosis of Laelaps and the fox Ovid has replaced the agency of Zeus in the Greek sources[37] with a vague reference to the will of "someone of the gods" (Invictos ambo . . . / esse deus voluit, si quis deus adfuit illis, 792–93).

Nowhere is the absence of the divine element more effective than at the ending. When Procris, dying, entreats Cephalus in the name of the gods (853), it is only to emphasize the bleakness of the human suffering and the long years of isolation to follow.

The gods themselves in this passage are far less important than Procris' appeal to the "sanctities of the marriage bond" and their "enduring love." Beside "the gods above" she places "my own gods" (852–56):

Per nostri foedera lecti
Perque deos supplex oro superosque meosque,
per si quid merui de te bene perque manentem
nunc quoque, cum pereo, causam mihi mortis amorem,
ne thalamis auram patiare innubere nostris.

There are no "pitying gods" here, as there are in the kindred tale of Ceyx and Alcyone (cf. superis miserantibus, 11.741)[38]. There is almost no solace at all, only unrelieved suffering and the tragic fusion of love with death, the self-destructiveness of a love which is "the cause of death," causam mihi mortis amorem (855).

Cephalus learns his mistake, explains the "error" to Procris, but even explanation brings little relief (858): sed quid docuisse iuvabat? ("But what help was it for her to have learned?"). This is one of the bleakest lines in the story. Cephalus had earlier found "relief" and "joy" in "remembering that happy time" (797–99): iuvat o meminisse beati / temporis . . . quo primos rite per annos / coniuge eram felix, felix erat illa marito. Whatever "help" or "joy" Cephalus could experience in memory is offset by the absence of that "help" or "joy" for Procris: quid docuisse iuvabat? Her anima is "unhappy," infelix, to the last (861; cf. 799).

37. Antoninus Liberalis 41.10.

38. See Otis (above, note 1) 272–73. For a harsher view of the Ceyx-Alcyone episode in the overall meaning of love in the Metamorphoses see Leo Curran, Arethusa 5 (1972) 74.

In the Ars Procris makes her fatal dash out of the woods exultant in her discovery that the feared mistress is only Aura, the wind. Her "senses and true complexion return" (A. A. 3.730), and she stirs the bushes in her eagerness (cf. agitato corpore) "a wife hastening to the embrace of her husband" (surgit et oppositas agitato corpore frondes / movit in amplexus uxor itura viri, A. A. 3.731–32). Here the joyful impulse at finding her husband faithful contrasts melodramatically with the disaster it causes. In the Metamorphoses the pain and the pathos are of a more inward nature. Procris dies nearly ignorant of the truth. The couple comes within a hairsbreadth of perpetuating to the very end the pattern of hurt and mutual misunderstanding which has ruined their lives before.

The only trace of consolation comes in the last line which Cephalus speaks: sed vultu meliore mori secura videtur (862). Even so, that verb videtur reveals the distance between them. Communication is broken. Cephalus is the onlooker now. He sees (cf. videtur) a silent face and makes an inference from its expression, but has no certain knowledge. The lack of any metamorphosis at this point not only results in greater concentration upon the human motivation, but also relinquishes the alternative to a tragic outcome which metamorphosis provides. Without metamorphosis there is no escaping the "either-or" of happiness or tragedy[39].

When the couple is ultimately joined in a "lasting love," manentem amorem (854–55), they can only look upon one another for the final parting (cf. 860, 862). Throughout the story sight and its dangers are played off against what is merely heard (cf. 821, 825, 833, 839, 843–44). At the end they leave behind the speech which has deceived them and removed them from each other in the past.

Cephalus' grief finds its natural outlet in tears (cf. 863 and 689–92, also 518). At this point Aeacus enters with the rest of his sons and his "new soldiery" (864–65). The miraculous intervention of the gods to renew life in Aeacus' story contrasts with the absence of the gods in Cephalus' tale and also with the hint of malign fata which

39. See Wolf H. Friedrich, Der Kosmos Ovids (1953), repr. in Ovid, edd. M. von Albrecht and E. Zinn, Wege der Forschung 92 (Darmstadt 1968) 367–68; cf. Otis 272; Segal, Landscape (above, note 11) chap. 5.

destroy life. Then the new day begun at the opening of the episode (7.663) shines more brightly (8.1–3):

iam nitidum retegente diem noctisque fugante
tempora Lucifero cadit Eurus et umida surgunt
nubila.

At this juncture softer light might have been kinder to Cephalus' grief.

As the morning star dispels night, natural and human events pursue their necessary course. The east wind by which Cephalus and his entourage "were happily brought" (feliciter acti, 8.4) falls and permits them to depart in a calm sea. Ovid carefully returns to the frame which introduced the episode (7.658–60):

"hi te ad bella pares annis animisque sequentur,
cum primum qui te feliciter attulit eurus"
(Eurus enim attulerat) "fuerat mutatus in austrum."

The verbal echo (feliciter attulit, 7.659, and feliciter acti, 8.4) brings back with it the public world and the martial setting in which stood Cephalus' arrival on Aegina to tell his tale (cf. 7.658, te ad bella . . . sequentur). Hence the poem can move on at once to Minos ravaging Megara (8.5). The framing devices and the contrasts are carefully plotted to enhance the unresolved, stark suffering of Cephalus' conclusion.

VI.

For all its moving power and psychological insight, the narrative of Cephalus and Procris, like other episodes in the Metamorphoses, has one great lack: Ovid does not face squarely the question of the meaning or non-meaning of such suffering. He is not deeply interested in the philosophical or religious dimensions of human suffering. He writes for an audience in whom ancient myths and ancient divinities fulfil aesthetic, not spiritual needs[40]. Hence he has borrowed some of the trappings of Greek tragedy, but not its power to create a broad moral framework in which such suffering can be viewed. By suppressing the divine machinery, Ovid throws his emphasis upon the emotional interactions of his two characters and the vicissitudes of the kind of love they inspire in one another.

40. See Friedrich (preceding note) 379.

Yet it would be wrong to conclude that moral considerations are utterly lacking or that Ovid's interest is only psychological. What is morally significant about the tale is that the psychology carries its own implicit morality. The very intensity of the love between Cephalus and Procris generates its own destruction: "love the cause of death," as Procris says (causam mihi mortis amorem, 7.855). The desire for perfect fidelity in their case leads to unrealistic demands. The possessiveness of this amor, like the jealous amor of elegiac poetry, destroys the love itself. Cephalus "decides" (statuo) to seek his own source of grief (7.720). The deliberate rationality of the verb underlines the irrationality of the action. Such a love seeks to create its own ideal world. The lasciviousness of the Greek tale becomes in the Latin poet a search for a kind of innocence, a desire for a perfection of love which the real world cannot bestow or permit to exist for long.

The lovers' demands destroy their love, but they cannot keep themselves from making the demands. An irrational, compulsive mechanism seems to urge the lovers on to destroy what they value most. We might be tempted to explain this repetition in psychological terms, as a kind of neurosis. Ovid does more, and suggests that it is part of an obscure destiny, the fata that "draw on" Cephalus (816) and the "cruel fate" (828) which Procris laments. This is the closest he comes to a dimension of truly tragic suffering: ἦθος ἀνθρώπῳ δαίμων, "Character is man's fate." The structures of our individual lives have their own dark fata. These fata in turn obey the promptings of our character and indeed, as Heraclitus suggests, perhaps are our character.

Ovid's tale contains many of the elements of Shakespeare's Othello, with Aurora as Iago and a Desdemona who mirrors back her own husband's fault. But the continuous, on-going movement of the carmen perpetuum militates against the tightness, coherence, and finality of tragedy. The episode is only one piece in a rapidly turning kaleidoscope[41].

The first-person frame of Cephalus' narrative provides a measure of reassuring non-tragic continuity. Cephalus' suffering is great, but it has not destroyed him. He has survived, apparently in not too bad shape: veteris retinens etiamnum pignora formae (7.497). The fact that we see the suffering through the eyes of the aged survivor enhances the pathos, but mellows the intensity.

41. Thus Hans Herter, Ovids Kunstprinzip in den Metamorphosen (1948), repr. in Von Albrecht and Zinn (above, note 39) 359 describes the poem as "ein unstetes Drängen von einem zum andern Bild, das sich selten Muße zu längerem Verweilen gönnt."

In handling the story of Cephalus Ovid shows himself cognizant of both the virtues and the limitations of his narrative form. He exploits to the full the contrasts and symmetries furnished by the interlocking tales of Minos, Aeacus, the Teumessian fox, and he lets us see Cephalus' suffering as part of a lifetime experience of grief and loss, focussed for us in its completeness and the symmetrical beauty of its sadness. Wistfulness is mingled with violence. It unfolds, with an echo of Ennius, in the silence of earliest morning, an old man's reminiscence. We withdraw into the "lovely recesses" of an ancient palace while an old king of valorous deeds sleeps the deep sleep of epic heroes. The dawn of a new day is then the setting for an old, old story, of love and death, happiness and loss, reunion and eternal separation.

Addendum

While this essay was in press appeared the stimulating and valuable article of Mario Labate, Amore coniugale e amore 'elegiaco' nell' episodio di Cefalo e Procri, Ann. della Scuola Normale Sup. di Pisa, Ser. III, 5 (1975) 103–128. Labate's study complements mine at several points. He stresses the combination of epic and elegiac elements in the narrative, reinterpreting Heinze's categories to show the tensions which Ovid develops between institutionalized conjugal love and the irresponsible, illicit love of the elegiac tradition.