

DIGITAL ACCESS TO SCHOLARSHIP AT HARVARD
DASH.HARVARD.EDU

HARVARD LIBRARY


# Pindaric Aspects of Ovid's Metamorphoses

## Citation

Lannom, Sarah Case. 2016. Pindaric Aspects of Ovid's Metamorphoses. Doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, Graduate School of Arts & Sciences.

## Link

http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:33493558

## Terms of use

This article was downloaded from Harvard University's DASH repository, and is made available under the terms and conditions applicable to Other Posted Material (LAA), as set forth at

https://harvardwiki.atlassian.net/wiki/external/NGY5NDE4ZjgzNTc5NDQzMGIzZWZhMGFlOWI2M2EwYTg

## Accessibility

https://accessibility.huit.harvard.edu/digital-accessibility-policy

## Share Your Story

The Harvard community has made this article openly available.
Please share how this access benefits you. Submit a story

# Pindaric Aspects of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*

A dissertation presented

by

Sarah Case Lannom

to

The Department of the Classics

in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
in the subject of
Classical Philology

Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts

May 2016

© 2016 Sarah Case Lannom
All rights reserved.

Dissertation Advisor: Richard Tarrant Sarah Case Lannom

# Pindaric Aspects of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*

## Abstract

This dissertation analyzes Ovid's *Metamorphoses* through the lens of praise and blame poetry and focuses on Pindar and possible allusions to epinician poetry. In particular, I look at the Apollo and Daphne episode (*Met*. 1.452–567), Lycaon's transformation (*Met*. 1.163–252), the *armorum iudicium* (*Met*. 12.620–13.398), and Ovid's praise (or not) of Julius and Augustus Caesar during the end of *Metamorphoses* 15 (*Met*. 15.745–879). In Chapter 1, I discuss how reading the Apollo and Daphne episode in the context of *Pythian* 9 and the founding of Cyrene illuminates darker aspects of Roman *Ktisissagen* by altering the epinician paradigm. Chapter 2 concerns the Lycaon episode and the way in which Jupiter takes on the role of an iambic poet. Chapter 3 consists of an analysis of Ulysses' speech and structural correspondences with praise poetry in Ovid's account of the *armorum iudicium*. In my conclusion, I consider Ovid's use of epinician topoi during the end of the *Metamorphoses*. When read through a Pindaric lens, these episodes illuminate Ovid's use of praise and blame poetry and his relationship with Augustus at this point in his career.

# Table of Contents


| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Abstract | | iii |
| Table of Contents | | iv |
| Acknowledgements | | v |
| Introduction | | 1 |
| Chapter 1: | Cupid Shot First: Apollo, Daphne, and *Pythian* 9 | 9 |
| Chapter 2: | I Find Your Lack of Faith Disturbing: Praise, Blame, and *Pythian* 2 in the Lycaon Episode | 47 |
| Chapter 3: | These Aren't the Arms You're Looking For: Odysseus/Ulysses, Praise Poetry, and Jedi Mind Tricks | 81 |
| Conclusion: | From a Certain Point of View: Subversive Epinician Discourse in *Metamorphoses* 15 | 128 |
| Bibliography | | 149 |

## Acknowledgements

This dissertation would have never made it beyond the planning stages without Richard Tarrant's expert guidance and wisdom. I cannot thank him enough for having been my advisor and helping me throughout this process. I would like to thank the other two members of my committee, Gregory Nagy and Richard Thomas, whose willingness to help supervise this unconventional dissertation has been greatly appreciated. Kathleen Coleman also deserves special thanks. I would have never passed my general exams without her help and have truly enjoyed working as her assistant for the past two years.

Many thanks to the wonderful classics professors whom I encountered at Swarthmore, namely Deborah Beck, Grace Ledbetter, and Bruce King. I would also like to thank my amazing high school teachers at Chatham Hall, Alan Spearman, Mary Edmonds, and Geoff Braun, who first taught me how to think critically about texts and life in general.

John Lannom has been tremendously supportive throughout the dissertation process and throughout my entire life. From listening to me wax on excessively about Ovid and Pindar to giving me constructive advice about navigating departmental politics, he has consistently been an encouraging voice of reason and the best dad anyone could ever have. Needless to say, I am most grateful to him for everything.

An expression of gratitude of some sort should go to the three nocturnal wild turkeys who began living under my bedroom window this semester. As a result of their incessant gobbling at all hours of the night, I was able to accomplish some serious thinking and writing since sleep was impossible. I would thank them individually by name; however, the names I have given them are suited neither for polite conversation nor the acknowledgements section of one's dissertation.

Finally, many thanks to Rebecca Katz, James Townshend, Julian Yolles, and Tom Keeline for being fantastic friends and colleagues. Without their friendship, good humor, ridiculous parties, and healthy dose of snark, the past seven years would have been terrible. Long live the Cabal!

# Introduction

The interactions between various literary genres throughout Ovid's *Metamorphoses* have been well documented and thoroughly analyzed.[1] Indeed, Ovid draws upon epic, elegy, tragedy, and other genres throughout the *Metamorphoses* in an attempt to produce an epic-like poem that does not quite conform to the generic expectations of epic. One genre and author that has been omitted from the general discussion of intertextuality and genre in the *Metamorphoses* is that of Pindar and epinician poetry. Indeed, most scholarship that mentions Pindar and Ovid in the same paragraph is primarily concerned with their use of a common source.[2]

Although Roman authors do not mention or allude to Pindar as frequently as other Greek authors, namely Homer, Callimachus, etc., Pindar's influence is nonetheless apparent in Roman literature. As one would expect since they were both lyric poets, Horace engaged with Pindar the most of any Latin author, particularly in *Odes* IV. Horace mentions Pindar by name more frequently than anyone else as well (*Odes* 1.3.10, 4.2.1, 4.2.8, 4.9.6 and *Epistles* 1.3.10). Though Pindar is certainly an influence for Horace's encomiastic poetry for Augustus, his direct references to Pindar occur in the context of Augustan *recusatio*. Most agree that Pindar heavily influenced Horace with regard to the structure and use of encomiastic discourse

[1] Knox 1986, Hinds 1987, Myers 1994, Keith 2002, and many others.

[2] E.g., Woodbury 1972:562 and Miller 2009:168n3.

throughout the *Odes*, particularly as far as his praise of Augustus is concerned.[3] Apart from Horace, Propertius mentions Pindar once in 3.17. Virgil potentially alludes to Pindar at the opening of *Georgics* 3. Ovid himself mentions Pindar once in the *Epistulae ex Ponto*.

However, one cannot speak of Pindaric reception among Latin authors without being mindful of the influence of Callimachus, whose reception and use of Pindar most likely affected the way Horace and other authors viewed and interpreted Pindar. Indeed, Zenodotus, Aristarchus, Aristophanes of Byzantium, and Didymus all undertook the painstaking task of editing Pindar's text, marking cola, and writing commentaries.[4] But apart from the nuts and bolts work of textual criticism, Callimachus engaged with Pindar to a huge extent, and given how much influence Callimachus and the other Hellenistic poets had on their Latin counterparts, their interpretations of Pindar and the genre of encomiastic poetry would have certainly affected how Latin authors read and used Pindar in their own poetry.

Many scholars have analyzed Callimachus' debt to Pindar and his use of encomiastic conventions in his hymns and other works. Callimachus' hymns incorporate many of the topoi and discourse endemic to epinician poetry. As Acosta-Hughes, Fuhrer, Hunter, and many

[3] See, among others, Williams 1974, Johnson 2005, and Thomas 2011 for a more detailed and better discussion of how Horace uses Pindaric paradigms to praise Augustus.

[4] See Pfeiffer 1969:117–118 for a more detailed discussion of Zenodotus and his edition of Pindar, 181–188 for the contributions of Aristophanes of Byzantium, 220–220 for Aristarchus' edition of Pindar, and 276–277 for Didymus' commentary on Pindar. See also Barbantani 2009:298–299 for more on the textual scholarship of Callimachus and Zenodotus.

others have discussed, Callimachus knew Pindar and his archaic predecessors well and adapted their formal poetic structures, including the Pindaric break-off and digressive formulae, and content to his own medium and circumstances.[5] Many of the poetic topoi we see in Callimachus that eventually make their way to the Augustan poets are ones that he adapted from Pindar, Hesiod, and other archaic poets, e.g. the wagon on the path, portraying poetic rivals as chattering birds, etc.[6] Indeed, Callimachus himself even wrote epinician poetry, though in elegiac couplets rather than lyric meters. For example, in the opening of his epinician for Berenice II's victory at the Nemean games, Callimachus echoes *Nemean* 1.[7] Theocritus in *Idyll* 17 uses the encomiastic medium in order to praise Ptolemy and Arsinoe, though whether the poem is truly epinician or hymnic in nature has been a source of debate.[8] Just as with Homer or any of the other archaic poets, poets of the Hellenistic era adapted Pindar, his genre, and his meter to their own medium. What might appear *prima facie* to be an allusion to Pindar might be an allusion to Callimachus who was alluding to Pindar.[9]

[5] See Fuhrer 1988 and 1992 for a detailed analysis, as well as Smiley 1914, Newman 1975.

[6] See Steiner 2007 for more on birds in Pindar, Hesiod, and Callimachus; see as well Acosta-Hughes 2010, Acosta-Hughes and Stephens 2012. Obviously, I will describe every instance of a Pindaric intertext in Callimachus, but this is one notable example out of many.

[7] See Acosta-Hughes and Stephens 2012:126–128 for a more in-depth analysis.

[8] See Gow 1950:325–326, Cairns 1972:104ff., Hunter 1996:77–82, Hunter 2003:8, Murray 2008:17–18, Barbantani 2009:306–307.

[9] E.g., the discussion of potential Pindaric aspects in *Georgics* 3 in Thomas 1998.

As mentioned previously, of all the Augustan poets, Horace seems to have engaged the most with Pindar, primarily as a result of writing in the genre of lyric poetry and employing the formal characteristics of praise poetry in order to praise Augustus, particularly in *Odes* 4 but also elsewhere as well.[10] Accordingly, Horace directly names Pindar more than any other Latin author. He echoes the opening of *Olympian* 2 in order to deliver a rendition of the typical Augustan *recusatio* in *Odes* 1.12.[11] He also alludes to *Pythian* 1 and *Pythian* 8 in *Odes* 3.4 in order to praise Augustus and Apollo at Actium.[12] He next directly refers to Pindar in *Odes* 4.2 in the same vein. Ironically, Pindar, the king of foils and priamels himself, becomes the foil for Horace's bee.[13] In *Epistles* 1.3.9–11, Horace refers to a poet by the name of Titius who does not fear drinking from Pindar's fountain, *Pindarici fontis qui non expalluit haustus* (*Epist*. 1.3.9). Generally speaking, with the possible exception of his naming of Titius in *Epistles* 1.3, whenever Horace mentions Pindar, he usually does so in the context of the Alexandrian *recusatio*, and Pindar becomes a foil for what Horace's poetry is not.

---

[10] See Highbarger 1935 for a comprehensive analysis of Pindaric structure in Horace. Miller 1998 for more on Horace's "Pindaric Apollo." See also Barchiesi 1996 as well as Hutchinson 2007 for Horace's use of other archaic lyric poets. See also Barchiesi 2009:319–335 for a general overview of archaic lyric reception in Rome. See also n2 above for more bibliography.

[11] See Hardie 2003 for more on possible Pindaric sources for Horace *Odes* 1.12 and Thomas 2007:50ff. for Horace's use of Callimachus.

[12] Miller 1998:545–552.

[13] See Thomas 2011:20–23 for more on how Horace deals with Pindar, Callimachus, and his own poetic agenda here. See also Bundy 1962 for more on Pindaric foils, priamels, and the formal structure of Pindar's epinician poems.

Propertius directly mentions Pindar only once in 3.17.40, *haec ego non humili referam memoranda coturno, / qualis Pindarico spiritus ore tonat*, and does so in the context of a *recusatio*, just like Horace. In fact, some have argued that Propertius actually alludes to Horace here rather than Pindar, given the parallels with *Odes* 4.2.7–8, cf. *fervet inmensusque ruit profundo / Pindarus ore*. Lyne argues for an allusion to *Pythian* 9 in 4.4 and thinks that Pindar's description of the relationship between Cyrene and sleep when guarding her father's flocks in *Pythian* 9.23 could be Propertius's source for describing the nature of Tarpeia's sleep in 4.4.[14] Apart from these two instances, however, Propertius does not seem to have heavily engaged with Pindar.

Virgil may or may not have alluded to Pindar at several points in his works, depending on one's opinion. There has been much discussion as to whether or not the opening of *Georgics* 3 is an allusion to *Olympian* 1; however, this is one of those instances in which an intervening Callimachean intertext is probably more likely.[15] Other instances of Callimachus rather than Pindar as the primary intertext include *Aeneid* 3.70ff. and *Pythian* 1.13ff., in which Virgil actually alludes to Homer and Callimachus rather than Pindar.[16] There is also a possible

[14] Lyne 1972:376–378.

[15] See Thomas 1998:99–120 for why Virgil most likely alludes to both Callimachus' *Victoria Berenices* and *Epgr.* 21.4 rather than *Olympian* 1 here. See Wilkinson 1970, Balot 1998, and others for arguments for a purely Pindaric intertext.

[16] Thomas 1998:116–120.

allusion to Pindar's telling of the Dioscuri myth at the end of *Nemean* 10 during Juturna's final speech in *Aeneid* 12.[17]

Cicero, strangely enough, directly names Pindar three times in his works and even quotes him twice in one of his letters to Atticus.[18] He names Pindar in *Orator* and in *De Finibus Bonorum et Malorum* 2.115.4; however Pindar appears here as one name in a list of other Greek authors, so the intertextual engagement is most likely negligible. He quotes Pindar three times throughout his *Epistulae ad Atticum*. In 12.5, he quotes *Nemean* 1.1, ἄμπνευμα σεμνὸν Ἀλφειοῦ, and in 13.38, he quotes Pindar twice, 'πότερον δίκᾳ τεῖχος ὕψιον', *id est utrum aperte hominem asperner et respuam*, 'ἢ σκολιαῖς ἀπάταις'. *ut enim Pindaro sic* 'δίχα μοι νόος ἀτρέκειαν εἰπεῖν'. Given that this is a fragment of Pindar, and that the first part of the quotation also appears in Plato, *Republic* 2.365b, it is rather difficult to see how Cicero uses Pindar here.

At first glance, Ovid seems an unlikely candidate for Pindaric reception, though surely he would have been familiar with the genre and author. Ovid only mentions Pindar by name once during in *Pont.* 4.16.28, *une / Pindaricae fidicen, tu quoque, Rufe, lyrae* (*Pont.* 4.16.27–28). In this particular poem, Ovid responds to one of his detractors in a manner that resembles his response to Envy in *Amores* 1.15. Indeed, this is the last poem of the *Epistulae ex Ponto*. The reference to Rufus who plays on a Pindaric lyre is found in a catalogue of other, lesser-known

[17] Manning 1998:221–222.

[18] See Steele 1900 for an exhaustive list of all the Greek quotations in Cicero's letters.

poets whom Ovid lists just as he does in *Amores* 1.15.9–30. As we have seen, this is perhaps typical of how the other Augustan poets used Pindar: either as part of a catalogue or in the *recusatio*. That Ovid would mention Pindar in the *Epistulae ex Ponto* is not surprising since much of the exile poetry does employ encomiastic discourse.[19]

Though not often discussed, elements of Pindar and epinician poetry do make several appearances throughout the *Metamorphoses*, but not in the way in which one usually thinks of intertextuality with one poet specifically echoing line 234 of a previous poet, *vel sim*. I argue that reading several myths in the *Metamorphoses* through a Pindaric lens enriches our understanding of them and sheds light on some interpretive difficulties.[20] I use "Pindaric lens" to refer to the act of keeping the basic structures of epinician poetry in mind as well as the paradigm of ritual compensation and reintegration.

There are four notable parts of the *Metamorphoses* in which a Pindaric lens enhances our understanding. This is perhaps most evident in the Apollo and Daphne episode, in which keeping *Pythian* 9 in mind raises questions about the nature of reintegrating the victor. Certainly Daphne becomes integrated into that which will eventually become Augustan Rome; however, is the glory that comes with being part of a community worth the loss of her identity and humanity? In the Lycaon episode, the age-old dichotomy between praise and blame poetry

[19] See the concluding chapter on epinician discourse in *Metamorphoses* 15 for more.

[20] Many thanks to RJT for the term "Pindaric lens."

during the *concilium deorum* and Lycaon's transformation into a wolf highlights the power possessed by both praise and invective poets. The structure of Ulysses' speech in Ovid's *amorum iudicium* and its lack of conformity to the typical structure of rhetoric has been a subject of scholarly inquiry for quite some time. Reading it with the basic characteristics of praise poetry in mind sheds light on the reasoning behind its structure and enhances Ulysses' slipperiness. Finally, Ovid uses structural aspects and topoi of praise poetry in his "praise" of Augustus at the end of the *Metamorphoses*, but actually employs it to praise himself and his own poetry and integrates himself into a poetic canon. By using an established form, he can be more subversive while ostensibly praising Augustus.

I do not have a grand unified theory of aspects of Pindar in Ovid, nor do I plan to develop one. However, given that the basic function of poetry and poetic discourse is to praise and blame, I do not think it too farfetched to explore the uses of praise and blame in the *Metamorphoses*.[21]

[21] As Dumézil 1943 has shown.

# Chapter 1
# Cupid Shot First: Apollo, Daphne, and *Pythian* 9

## Introduction

The Apollo and Daphne episode (*Met.* 1.452–557) occupies a particularly programmatic position in the *Metamorphoses*. Indeed, it is the point at which Ovid transitions from the epic themes that comprise the first 400 lines of the poem to lighter, amatory material characteristic of elegy. Accordingly, many have discussed the relationship between Apollo's argument with Cupid and the opening of *Amores* 1.1 as well as the prologue of Callimachus' *Aetia*.[22] Others have noted that Ovid most likely draws on Parthenius' version of Daphne and Apollo, which is the first account of the myth that describes Daphne's transformation into the laurel tree.[23] Although allusions to *Amores* 1.1 and other Hellenistic sources certainly occur throughout the Apollo and Daphne episode in the *Metamorphoses*, there is another possible author and genre at work here—Pindar and epinician poetry.

The Apollo and Daphne myth begins as a result of Apollo's establishment of the Pythian Games in order to commemorate his victory over the Python. However, victors at these

[22] Fränkel 1945:78, Stephens 1958:287–289, Otis 1966:101, Bömer 1969: *ad loc*., Nicoll 1980, Knox 1986:14–20, Solodow 1988:21, Myers 1994:61–62, Anderson 1995:190–191, Harrison 2002:88, Keith 2002:246–248, Miller 2009:169. Wills 1990 argues for Ovid's incorporation of Callimachus' *Hymn to Delos* as well as the *Aetia*.

[23] See Bömer 1969: *ad loc*. for more on Ovid's use of Parthenius.

inaugural games did not receive laurel garlands as would be customary in later times since the laurel did not yet exist:[24]

> hic iuuenum quicumque manu pedibusue rotaue
> uicerat aesculeae capiebat frondis honorem.
> nondum laurus erat, longoque decentia crine
> tempora cingebat de qualibet arbore Phoebus.[25]
>
> *Metamorphoses* 1.448–452

> At these games every youth who had been victorious in boxing, running, or the chariot race received the honour of an oaken garland. For as yet the laurel-tree was not, and Phoebus was wont to wreathe his temples, comely with flowing locks, with a garland from any tree.[26]

In order to explain the origins of the laurel, Ovid describes Apollo's spat with Cupid, which then leads to his unsuccessful pursuit of Daphne and her transformation into the laurel tree. *Pythian* 9 features Apollo's infatuation with Cyrene, which then results in the founding of the eponymous city in Libya.[27] Cyrene bears a striking resemblance to Daphne in the *Metamorphoses*. Both women eschew traditional female activities and prefer to hunt in the wilderness. Apollo's behavior is markedly similar as well. In both poems, Apollo falls in love

[24] For a more detailed survey of garlands worn at athletic competitions and accounts of how they changed over time, see Hollis 1996. For a discussion of how Ovid rejects Callimachus' aetiology of the laurel crown, see Knox 1990:195.

[25] The text of the *Metamorphoses* quoted throughout is R.J. Tarrant's 2004 OCT.

[26] Translations from the 1984 Loeb.

[27] Woodbury 1972:562 and Miller 2009:168n3 both mention in passing that Pindar and Ovid both tell the story of Apollo's first love affair; however, they do not further investigate the intertextual relationship between the two accounts.

with a woman who exhibits atypical female behavior, desires to marry her, and temporarily loses his powers of prophecy. Pindar composed the ode for Telesicrates, the winner in the hoplite race, who hailed from Cyrene. As is typical, Pindar gives the hometown of the *laudandus* special consideration and includes a foundation myth.[28] Pindar's possible sources include Hesiod's *Eoiae* and lost epic fragments.[29] Most critical treatments of *Pythian* 9 focus on the relationship between Apollo, Cyrene, and Telesicrates as well as the interplay of footraces and marriage rites, both of which Pindar mentions frequently throughout the ode.[30] The relationship between footraces and marriage rites and founding myths all enhance our interpretation of this episode in the *Metamorphoses*.

If we read Ovid's account of Apollo and Daphne in *Metamorphoses* 1 in the context of *Pythian* 9, the sexual violence and allusions to Augustan Rome become even more unsettling. By placing the paradigm upon which epinician poetry is based in a "real-life" setting, Ovid parodies Pindar and all of epinician poetry by casting Apollo in the role of an epinician poet and Daphne in the role of a victor who resists integration into the community. However, apart from the episode's humorous aspects, the violence and vegetal imagery within *Pythian* 9 in

[28] See Schmid 1947:108–115 for more on the various accounts of the founding of Cyrene.

[29] See Bowra 1964:60–61 as well as Robbins 1978:92 and n4 for more on Pindar's use of the *Eoiae*. Burton 1962:38 thinks this myth is "undigested epic material."

[30] For more on marriage rituals and footraces throughout the ode, see Woodbury 1972, Robbins 1978, Carson 1982, Grethlein 2011:390–391. For more on love and erotic language in Pindar in general, see Instone 1990.

Ovid's account of Daphne's transformation into the laurel tree lends an ambivalent tone to the establishment of Augustan Rome.

## *Apollo Amans* in Pindar and Ovid

Apollo's infatuation with both Cyrene in *Pythian* 9 and Daphne in *Metamorphoses* 1 is quite similar, especially with regard to his preferences in women. Indeed, Daphne and Cyrene are even related through their common ancestor Peneus. The opening line of the episode prominently features Daphne's parentage, *primus amor Phoebi Daphne Peneia* (*Met.* 1.452). Pindar tells us in *Pythian* 9 that Cyrene was also descended from Peneus.[31]

> ὅν ποτε Πίνδου κλεεναῖς ἐν πτυχαῖς
> Ναΐς ἐυφρανθεῖσα Πηνει-
> οῦ λέχει Κρέοισ' ἔτικτεν,
> Γαίας θυγάτηρ.[32]
>
> *Pythian* 9.15–17

> Whom once in the famous glens of Pindus
> Creusa, the Naid daughter of Gaea, bore
> After finding joy in the bed of Peneius.[33]

This genealogical connection strengthens the ties between Daphne and Cyrene and between *Metamorphoses* 1 and *Pythian* 9.

[31] For a more detailed "family tree" of Cyrene, see Robbins 1978:95.

[32] The text of Pindar quoted throughout is from Snell and Maehler's 1971 Teubner.

[33] Translations of Pindar are from William Race's Loeb.

Both Cyrene and Daphne, after Cupid wounds her with his lead arrow, explicitly reject the typical trappings of femininity:

> ... fugit altera nomen amantis,
> siluarum latebris captiuarumque ferarum
> exuuiis gaudens innuptaeque aemula Phoebes.
> [uitta coercebat positos sine lege capillos.]
> multi illam petiere, illa auersata petentes
> impatiens expersque uiri nemora auia lustrat,
> nec, quid Hymen, quid Amor, quid sint conubia curat.
>
> *Metamorphoses* 1.474–480

> ... but she fled the very name of love,
> rejoicing in the deep fastnesses of the woods, and in the spoils of beasts
> which she had snared, vying with the virgin Phoebe. A single fillet
> bound her locks all unarranged. Many sought her; but she, averse
> to all suitors, impatient of control and without thought for man,
> roamed the pathless woods, nor cared at all that Hymen, love, or
> wedlock might be.

> ... ἁ μὲν οὔθ' ἱ-
> στῶν παλιμβάμους ἐφίλησεν ὁδούς,
> οὔτε δείπνων †οἰκουριᾶν μεθ' ἑταιρᾶν τέρψιας,
> ἀλλ' ἀκόντεσσίν τε χαλκέοις
> φασγάνῳ τε μαρναμένα κεράϊζεν ἀγ'ρίους
> θῆρας, ἦ πολλάν τε καὶ ἡσύχιον
> βουσὶν εἰρήναν παρέχοισα πατρῴαις,
> τὸν δὲ σύγκοιτον γλυκύν
> παῦρον ἐπὶ γ'λεφάροις
> ὕπνον ἀναλίσκοισα ῥέποντα πρὸς ἀῶ.
>
> *Pythian* 9.18–22

> She, however, did not care

for pacing back and forth at the loom
nor for the delights of meals with companions at home,
but with bronze javelins
and a sword she would fight and slay the wild
beasts, and truly she provided much peaceful
security for her father's cattle,
while only briefly expending upon her eyelids
that sweet bed-mate
the sleep that descends upon them toward dawn.

As is evident from the passages quoted above, Daphne and Cyrene share disdain for typical womanly activities and prefer the great outdoors. Cyrene shuns weaving and meals with other women in favor of leading a solitary existence hunting wild animals and protecting her father's flocks. Though Daphne shares Cyrene's love for hunting and the outdoors, unlike Cyrene, she explicitly rejects the idea of marriage or amatory activities and even asks her father for perpetual virginity (*Met*. 1.486–487). Ovid goes so far to say that she detests the idea of marriage to such an extent that she nearly regards it as a crime, *illa uelut crimen taedas exosa iugales* (*Met*. 1.483). Cyrene's rejection of typical trappings of ancient womanhood extends primarily to household activities and conversing with female friends. However, the lives of Daphne and Cyrene change dramatically after encountering Apollo.

Apollo in *Metamorphoses* 1 and in *Pythian* 9 finds himself in similar situations. Immediately after catching sight of both of the women, he falls in love and becomes temporarily bereft of his prophetic powers. In *Pythian* 9, Apollo happens upon Cyrene while

she wrestles a lion and is struck by her bravery. He subsequently summons Chiron from his nearby cave in order to inquire about Cyrene's origins and to ask whether it would be acceptable for him to have his way with Cyrene.

> κίχε νιν λέοντί ποτ' εὐρυφαρέτρας
> ὀβ'ρίμῳ μούναν παλαίοισαν
> ἄτερ ἐγχέων ἑκάεργος Ἀπόλλων.
> αὐτίκα δ' ἐκ μεγάρων Χείρωνα προσήνεπε φωνᾷ·
> ʿσεμνὸν ἄντρον, Φυλλυρίδα, προλιπὼν
> θυμὸν γυναικὸς καὶ μεγάλαν δύνασιν
> θαύμασον, οἷον ἀταρβεῖ νεῖκος ἄγει κεφαλᾷ,
> μόχθου καθύπερθε νεᾶνις
> ἦτορ ἔχοισα· φόβῳ δ'οὐ κεχείμανται φρένες.
> τίς νιν ἀνθρῶπων τέκεν; ποῖ
> ας δ' ἀποσπασθεῖσα φύτλας
> ὀρέων κευθμῶνας ἔχει σκιοέντων,
> γεύεται δ' ἀλκᾶς ἀπειράντου;
> ὁσία κλυτὰν χέρα οἱ προσενεγκεῖν
> ἦρα καὶ ἐκ λεχέων κεῖραι μελιαδέα ποίαν;'
>
> *Pythian* 9.26–32

> Apollo, the far-shooting god with the broad quiver,
> once came upon her as she was wrestling with
> a mighty lion, alone and unarmed.
> At once he called Chiron from his halls and said,
> "Come forth from your sacred cave, son of Philyra,
> and marvel at this woman's courage and great power
> and at what a fight she is waging with unflinching head,
> a girl whose heart is superior to toil
> and whose mind remains unshaken by storms of fear.
> What mortal bore her? From what stock
> has she been severed
> that she lives in the glens of the shadowy mountains

and puts to the test her unbounded valor?
Is it right to lay my famous hand upon her
and indeed to reap the honey-sweet flower from the bed
of love?"

Chiron gently rebukes Apollo and remarks that his passion for Cyrene has caused him to lose his powers of prophecy:

'κρυπταὶ κλαΐδες ἐντὶ σοφᾶς
Πειθοῦς ἱερᾶν φιλοτάτων,
Φοῖβε, καὶ ἔν τε θεοῖς τοῦτο κἀνθρώποις ὁμῶς
αἰδέοντ', ἀμφανδὸν ἁδεί-
ας τυχεῖν τὸ πρῶτον εὐνᾶς.
καὶ γὰρ σέ, τὸν οὐ θεμιτὸν ψεύδει θιγεῖν,
ἔτ'ραπε μείλιχος ὀργὰ παρφάμεν τοῦ-
τον λόγον. κούρας δ' ὁπόθεν γενεάν
ἐξερωτᾷς, ὦ ἄνα; κύριον ὃς πάντων τέλος
οἶσθα καὶ πάσας κελεύθους·

*Pythian* 9.39–45

Hidden are the keys to sacred
lovemaking that belong to wise Persuasion,
Phoebus, and both gods and humans alike
shy from engaging openly for the first time
in sweet love.
And so your amorous impulse prompted you,
for whom it is not right to touch upon a lie, to make
that misleading speech. Do you ask from where
the girl's lineage comes, O lord? And yet you know
the appointed end of all things and all the ways to them.

Chiron chides Apollo for having become so taken with Cyrene as she wrestles the lion that he—the god of prophecy himself—has lost his ability to see the future and must ask Chiron for

advice. Nonetheless, Chiron tells Apollo that he has come to the grove in order to marry Cyrene and establish her as ruler of the eponymous city.

Similarly, the Apollo of the *Metamorphoses* falls in love with Daphne immediately after seeing her for the first time. Unlike Pindar's Apollo, however, whose lustful intentions are tempered by Chiron's prophecy that he must legitimately marry Cyrene rather than carrying her away for a one-night stand, Ovid's Apollo immediately desires marriage. Ovid subsequently comments that the god loses his prophetic powers:

> Phoebus amat uisaeque cupit conubia Daphnes,
> quodque cupit sperat suaque illum oracula fallunt.
>
> *Metamorphoses* 1.491–492

> Phoebus loves Daphne at sight,
> and longs to wed her; and what he longs for, that he hopes; and his
> own gifts of prophecy deceive him.

Ovid uses the same motif of love obscuring Apollo's ability to see the future as Pindar, but expands upon it in the *Metamorphoses*. Several lines later while pursuing Daphne through the woods, Apollo himself acknowledges that he has lost his divine powers while pursuing Daphne:

> Iuppiter est genitor; per me quod eritque fuitque
> estque patet; per me concordant carmina neruis.
> certa quidem nostra est, nostra tamen una sagitta
> certior, in vacuo quae uulnera pectore fecit.
> inuentum medicina meum est, opiferque per orbem
> dicor, et herbarum subiecta potentia nobis.
> ei mihi, quod nullis amor est sanabilis herbis,

nec prosunt domino, quae prosunt omnibus, artes!

*Metamorphoses* 1.517–524

> Jove is my father. By me what
> shall be, has been, and what is are all revealed; by me the lyre
> responds in harmony to song. My arrow is sure of aim, but oh, one
> arrow, surer than my own, has wounded my heart but now so
> fancy free. The art of medicine is my discovery. I am called Help-
> Bringer throughout the world, and all the potency of herbs is
> given unto me. Alas, that love is curable by no herbs, and the
> arts which heal all others cannot heal their lord!

Apollo's powers of prophecy have failed him, along with his knowledge of medicine, poetry, and impressive pedigree. Moreover, Ovid's Apollo has no interlocutor such as Chiron to advise him whether or not to pursue Daphne; rather, he delivers a lengthy monologue filled with rhetorical devices that ultimately fails to achieve its objective. Not only is Apollo's speech characteristic of Ovid's tendency to show how impressively crafted displays of rhetoric are usually not successful, e.g. the elegiac lover's speech in *Amores* 1.1, but it also responds to part of Chiron's conversation with Apollo in *Pythian* 9.[34] The first words Chiron says in response to Apollo's question regarding whether it is right for him to carry off Cyrene involve the "keys of persuasion" and how they happen to be hidden, κρυπταὶ κλαΐδες ἐντὶ σοφᾶς / Πειθοῦς ἱερᾶν (*Pythian* 9.38–39). For Ovid's Apollo, the "keys of persuasion" are most certainly hidden, because he fails to persuade Daphne that she should stop running from him.

[34] See also Gross 1979:309 for more on Apollo's inability to be persuasive in this passage. For more on the ineffectiveness of rhetoric and lengthy speeches in Ovid, see Tarrant 1995.

Both myths also have the motif of marriage and the footrace in common, albeit in slightly different sequences. During his telling of the myth, Pindar spends most of his time recounting the conversation between Chiron and Apollo while watching Cyrene. He devotes only a few lines to the "marriage" between Apollo and Cyrene:

> ὣς ἄρ' εἰπὼν ἔντυεν τερ-
> πνὰν γάμου κραίνειν τελευτάν.
> ὠκεῖα δ' ἐπειγομένων ἤδη θεῶν
> πρᾶξις ὁδοί τε βραχεῖαι.
>
> *Pythian* 9.65–67

> Thus he spoke and encouraged him to consummate
> the sweet fulfillment of marriage.
> Swift is the accomplishment once gods are in haste,
> and short are the ways.

As soon as Apollo hears the entire prophecy from Chiron, he carries Cyrene off to Libya and fulfills it. All of this happens quickly, as Pindar comments, ὠκεῖα δ' ἐπειγομένων ἤδη θεῶν / πρᾶξις ὁδοί τε βραχεῖαι (*Pyth.* 9.66–67). Pindar returns to a discussion of quickness and pursuit at the end of the poem during his description of how Antaeus and Danaus married their daughters by means of a footrace.[35] Danaus set his forty-eight daughters at the finish line and made their suitors race to them, and Antaeus did the same for his daughter. Telesicrates'

[35] See Magrath 1977 for a more detailed analysis of the Antaeus myth. For another instance of marriage and footraces in Ovid, cf. Atalanta and Hippomenes (*Met*. 10.560–637).

ancestor, Alexidamus, is the victor and bridegroom in this particular race and marriage ceremony. Pindar describes the scene as follows:

> οὕτω δ' ἐδίδου Λίβυς ἁρμόζων κόρᾳ
> νυμφίον ἄνδρα· ποτὶ γ'ραμμᾷ μὲν αὐτὰν
> στᾶσε κοσμήσαις, τέλος ἔμμεν ἄκρον,
> εἶπε δ' ἐν μέσσοις ἀπάγεσθαι, ὃς ἂν πρῶτος θορών
> ἀμφί οἱ ψαύσειε πέπ'λοις.
>
> *Pythian* 9.117–120

> The Libyan made a similar offer for matching
> a groom to his daughter. He adorned her
> and set her at the finish line as the grand prize
> and declared in their midst that whoever first leapt forward
> and touched her dress would take her away with him.

As we see from the passage quoted above, Antaeus makes his daughter the literal prize in the footrace he stages, and the first person to touch her clothing, ψαύσειε πέπλοις (*Pyth*. 9.120), not only receives the right to marry her but also "wins" her as a literal trophy for having won the race. After Alexidamus' victory, the spectators shower him and his new bride with leaves and garland in a ceremony known as the *phullobolia*.[36]

> πολλὰ μὲν κεῖνοι δίκον
> φύλλ' ἔπι καὶ στεφάνους·
> πολλὰ δὲ π'ρόσθεν πτερὰ δέξατο νικᾶν.

[36] See Carson 1982:123 and 127–128 for more on this ritual. See section three of this chapter for how it relates to Apollo and Daphne in the *Metamorphoses*.

*Pythian* 9.123–125

Many were the leaves
and crowns they showered upon him—
and many the winged wreaths of victories he had won
before.

As we shall see, the intertwined motifs of marriage, competition, and vegetation are essential components of Apollo's failed pursuit of Daphne in the *Metamorphoses*.

Ovid uses the themes of marriage, speed, and footraces throughout the Apollo and Daphne episode. Immediately after being approached by Apollo, Daphne flees with Apollo hot on her heels. Presumably, if Apollo had managed to grasp Daphne before her transformation into the laurel, he would have taken possession of her in the same way that Alexidamus does with Antaeus' daughter. Indeed, Apollo nearly succeeds, as Ovid describes him breathing on the back of her neck, *imminet et crinem sparsum ceruicibus adflat* (*Met*.1.542). Needless to say, this is not the joyful marriage ceremony Pindar describes—the "bride" or trophy is a moving target rather than one that stands at the finish line and one that is unwilling to be caught. Daphne herself is both a competitor in a footrace and an unwilling potential prize for victory in this contest.

More importantly, unlike Pindar's Apollo, Ovid's Apollo is ultimately unsuccessful in his attempt to seduce and marry Daphne. Rather than suffer the indignity of being raped by

Apollo, Daphne begs her father to change her into a less desirable form and turns into a laurel tree.

> uicta labore fugae, spectans Peneidas undas,
> ‘fer, pater’ inquit, ‘opem, si flumina numen habetis;
> qua nimium placui, mutanto perde figuram.’
> uix prece finita torpor grauis occupat artus;
> mollia cinguntur tenui praecordia libro;
> in frondem crines, in ramos bracchia crescunt;
> pes modo tam uelox pigris radicibus haeret;
> ora cacumen habet; remanet nitor unus in illa.
>
> *Metamorphoses* 1.544–552

> and utterly overcome by the toil of her swift flight,
> seeing her father’s waters near, she cried: “O father, help! If your
> waters hold divinity; change and destroy this beauty by which I
> pleased o’er well.” Scarce had she thus prayed when a down-
> dragging numbness seized her limbs, and her soft sides were
> begirt with thin bark. Her hair was changed to leaves, her arms to
> branches. Her feet, but now so swift, grew fast in sluggish roots,
> and her head was now but a tree’s top. Her gleaming beauty alone
> remained.

When Daphne realizes she cannot outrun Apollo, she undergoes a metamorphosis into the laurel, which will be a victory crown for Apollo. In the process, she removes the motif of marriage from the competition and disqualifies herself as a competitor. Apollo, however, fails to recognize her metamorphosis at first and still tries to embrace her.

> hanc quoque Phoebus amat, positaque in stipite dextra
> sentit adhuc trepidare nouo sub cortice pectus,
> complexusque suis ramos, ut membra, lacertis

oscula dat ligno; refugit tamen oscula lignum.

*Metamorphoses* 1.553–556

But even now in this new form Apollo loved her; and placing
his hand upon the trunk, he felt the heart still fluttering beneath
the bark. He embraced the branches as if human limbs, and
pressed his lips upon the wood. But even the wood shrank from
his kisses.

Upon realizing that he cannot marry a tree, no matter how beautiful she may have been in her previous state, Apollo consoles himself by appropriating the laurel tree for his own purposes.

cui deus ‘at quoniam coniunx mea non potes esse,
arbor eris certe’ dixit ‘mea; semper habebunt
te coma, te citharae, te nostrae, laure, pharetrae
tu ducibus Latiis aderis, cum laeta Triumphum
uox canet et uisent longas Capitolia pompas;
postibus Augustis eadem fidissima custos
ante fores stabis mediamque tuebere quercum.
utque meum intonsis caput est iuuenale capillis,
tu quoque perpetuos semper gere frondis honores.’

*Metamorphoses* 1. 557–565

And the god cried out to this: “Since thou canst not be
my bride, thou shalt at least be my tree. My hair, my lyre, my
quiver shall always be entwined with thee, O laurel. With thee
shall Roman generals wreathe their heads, when shouts of joy
shall acclaim their triumph, and long processions climb the
Capitol. Thou at Augustus’ portals shalt stand a trusty guardian,
and keep watch over the civic crown of
oak which hangs between. And as my head is ever young and my
locks unshorn, so do thou keep the beauty of thy leaves
perpetual.”

Moreover, by informing Daphne about her future as a prominent symbol of Rome, Apollo regains his power of prophecy and in the process echoes Chiron's speech to Pindar's Apollo in *Pythian* 9 in terms of Daphne's elevated status as a result of her association with him. The prominence of marriage both at the beginning when Apollo first sees Daphne, *Phoebus amat uisaeque cupit conubia Daphnes* (*Met.* 1.490) and end, *at quoniam coniunx mea non potes esse* (*Met.* 1.557), of the episode in the *Metamorphoses* is all as a result of this paradigm. Daphne thus transforms from potential bride to a symbol of victory and even of empire, which causes one to consider the role of victory and marriage in both Pindar and Ovid.

## Exchange Rituals, Marriage, and Integration of the Victor

The relationship between Cyrene in *Pythian* 9 and Daphne in *Metamorphoses* 1 becomes more complex when placed in the context of the sociological and ritualistic aspects of Pindar's epinician poetry—namely, those relating to marriage, exchange rituals, and compensation. The epinician poet takes on the responsibility of compensating the victor for his ordeal in athletic competition, which in and of itself functions as repayment for a crime or ordeal that occurred in myth. Nagy comments, "In the mythical past, some catastrophe occurs, typically but not necessarily entailing some form of guilt or pollution. Then a ritual is instituted to compensate

for that one event."[37] The poet, therefore, compensates the athlete for his exertions by means of the victory ode.[38] Leslie Kurke in *The Traffic in Praise* analyzes how the pattern of exchange and recompense functions within the societies of the victors and how the praise and glory granted by Pindar's epinician poems works as a sort of symbolic capital.[39] The elaborate exchange of this symbolic capital from the victor to the poet to the community itself assists in integrating the victor back into his community and in mitigating jealousy that arises from members of the community. In order to facilitate the integration process, Pindar uses metaphors related to basic rituals of exchange throughout his poetry, such as marriage, childbirth, funerary rituals, etc. By placing the athlete's success within a system of exchange, Pindar attempts to minimize any such envy.[40] Marriage in particular, as one of the most enduring systems of exchange in human society, plays a prominent role in both *Pythian* 9 and, as we shall see, the Apollo and Daphne episode.[41]

---

[37] Nagy 1990:140.

[38] Nagy 1990:142.

[39] Kurke 1991:1–12. Moreover, Instone 1990:32–33 notes that athletic events were often prime opportunities for arranging marriages.

[40] Kurke 1991:86.

[41] For more on marriage as part of a system of exchange, see Levi-Strauss 1969:66–69. For more on gift exchange in general, see Mauss 1992.

Many scholars have commented on the prominence of marriage imagery throughout *Pythian* 9 in which Pindar describes three different marriages.[42] The first is Apollo's marriage to Cyrene, then Danaus' marriage of his multiple daughters, and then finally Alexidamus' marriage of Antaeus' daughter. As Anne Carson and others have observed, Pindar's intense focus on marriage throughout the poem works as a foil whereby Telesicrates achieves reintegration back into his community of Cyrene. Carson comments, "if the victor's personal value is not mingled with that of his community, then it has no life."[43] Carson continues by arguing that Pindar depicts "marriage as a civilizing thing, as a ceremony and an activity which incorporates into the productive life of the community an individual who would otherwise remain solitary, savage, sterile."[44] Cyrene and Alexidamus work as foils for Telesicrates. Cyrene's wrestling prowess and overall athleticism are meaningless if not recognized by a larger community, and Apollo facilitates this recognition by establishing her as the founder of the city that bears her name. Similarly, Telesicrates' victory in the hoplite race would be meaningless without Pindar and his poetry to proclaim him as the victor and assimilate him back into the community of Cyrene. Like Alexidamus who brings home a bride

[42] Burton 1962:44, Woodbury 1972, Magrath 1977:207, Robbins 1978:97–99, Carson 1982, Kurke 1991:130–133, Grethlein 2011:386–390.

[43] Carson 1982:26.

[44] Carson 1982:127. See also Robbins 1978:98. Ovid himself even describes Apollo's love as "sterile" after Cupid first wounds him, *sterilem sperando nutrit amorem* (*Met*. 1.496), which perhaps foreshadows how Daphne will not be integrated in the manner of a typical victor and/or wife.

who will then be a source of pride both for him and his community, Teleiscrates brings home a victory, which functions in a similar fashion. The marriage motif thus works as a metaphor for the compensation and reintegration of the victor.[45]

How do ritual compensation, integration of the victor, and marriage work in the Apollo and Daphne episode? As mentioned in the previous section of this chapter, Ovid combines Pindar's description of Alexidamus' race that results in marriage with the marriage of Apollo and Cyrene. However, both Apollo and Daphne occupy multiple roles in the paradigm of poet, athlete, and prize, and their roles constantly shift. Like Cyrene and Telesicrates, Daphne becomes the solitary victor who must be integrated into society. Unlike Cyrene and Telesicrates, she resists integration in the form of Apollo's unwanted advances, which results in the footrace between her and the god. Apollo's involvement at this point is complicated as well. By attempting to bring Daphne out of the wilderness, he takes on the role of a praise poet as well as a competitor in the race.

Moreover, Pindar often equates his role as the poet with the ordeal experienced by the athlete throughout his poetry. Ovid takes this tendency to its extreme in the Apollo and Daphne episode.[46] Just as in *Amores* 3.1, in which Ovid places the elegiac *recusatio* in a "real-life" setting by describing his encounter with the personified genres of Tragedy and Elegy, he

[45] Kurke 1991:117.

[46] For more on how Pindar describes his poetic performances in terms of an athletic competition, see Lefkowitz 1984 as well as Kurke 1988.

literalizes and parodies the paradigm upon which Pindar's poetry is based. Apollo represents the praise poet who performs a poem both in an attempt to compensate him (or her, in this scenario) for his labor and in an attempt to gain *kleos* for the poet himself. When all is said and done, it is Pindar's name we remember—not so much those of the individual athletes whom he honors. Ovid introduces a complication into the typical epinician paradigm, however, by means of Daphne's unwillingness to be compensated and integrated. What happens when a victor does not want to be reintegrated into the confines of society and prefers to stay in remote isolation?

As the footrace draws to a close, the lines between poet, competitor, and victor become even more blurred as a result of Daphne's transformation into the laurel, which raises questions regarding the identity of the victor in this competition.[47] Not only does she transform from human to tree, she transitions from being in Cyrene's position to occupying the place of Alexidamus' wife—the reward for victory. Apollo then becomes a hybrid of Alexidamus: a victor since he does receive a laurel and a praise poet as a result of his speech to Daphne at the end.

Apollo's speech to Daphne regarding her new status as his symbol as well as that of Augustan Rome constitutes a praise poem of sorts. After Daphne's ordeal through the race and

[47] Incidentally, neither USATF nor the IAAF have any regulations concerning the sudden transformation of athletes into trees or other forms of vegetation during competition.

her turning into a tree, Apollo "compensates" her, as it were, for her labor by devoting nine lines to praising Daphne in her new form as a laurel tree and describing the fame and glory she will receive as Apollo's personal tree.

> cui deus 'at quoniam coniunx mea non potes esse,
> arbor eris certe' dixit 'mea; semper habebunt
> te coma, te citharae, te nostrae, laure, pharetrae
> tu ducibus Latiis aderis, cum laeta Triumphum
> uox canet et uisent longas Capitolia pompas;
> postibus Augustis eadem fidissima custos
> ante fores stabis mediamque tuebere quercum.
> utque meum intonsis caput est iuuenale capillis,
> tu quoque perpetuos semper gere frondis honores.
>
> *Metamorphoses* 1.557–565

> And the god cried out to this: "Since thou canst not be
> my bride, thou shalt at least be my tree. My hair, my lyre, my
> quiver shall always be entwined with thee, O laurel. With thee
> shall Roman generals wreathe their heads, when shouts of joy
> shall acclaim their triumph, and long processions climb the
> Capitol. Thou at Augustus' portals shalt stand a trusty guardian,
> and keep watch over the civic crown of
> oak which hangs between. And as my head is ever young and my
> locks unshorn, so do thou keep the beauty of thy leaves
> perpetual."

Unlike Apollo's unsuccessful monologue earlier in the episode in which he delivers a catalogue of all of his positive attributes in an attempt to glorify himself, here he praises Daphne and predicts her future renown both as his personal emblem and as a prominent symbol of Augustan Rome. It is only when Apollo stops praising himself as he does while chasing Daphne

and shifts to praising her in the manner of a praise poet that he regains his powers of prophecy and gains a prize. His regaining of prophetic powers resembles the way in which Pindar presents himself as having a clear view of the future in his epinician poems.[48] Although Apollo's speech does not entirely fit the paradigm of praise poetry in which Pindar would praise Daphne, her ancestors, and her community, he uses hymnic discourse with repeated second person pronouns, e.g. *te coma, te citharae, te nostrae* (*Met.* 1.559). Normal Pindaric praise poetry might not work in this situation simply because Daphne has no community into which she can be reintegrated, since she has been living in the woods. The episode concludes with the phrase *finierat Paean* (*Met.* 1.566). Although *Paean* can simply refer to Apollo's status as a healer, it can also indicate praise poetry, which further strengthens the connections between this episode and *Pythian* 9.[49] Moreover, Apollo's description of Daphne as a Roman civic symbol in the distant future resembles the ritual in which the victor would dedicate his crown to his hometown in order to give it *kudos* and further partake in the system of exchange.[50] Indeed, as Kurke comments, "And in *Pythian* 9, Telesicrates is himself the crown the city is to receive."[51] In this way, Ovid alters the conventions of praise poetry by having one of the participants in a

[48] Mackie 2003:77–106 for more on Pindar and prophecy. See also Hardie 2002:47 for how Apollo and prophecy work in terms of verbally appropriating Daphne.

[49] OLD s.v. 2. Anderson 1995: *ad loc*. thinks this refers solely to Apollo's status as a healer. Needless to say, I disagree.

[50] Kurke 1991:206–207.

[51] Kurke 1991:207.

competition deliver a quasi-epinician poem. When Apollo shifts from praising himself in the footrace to praising Daphne, he can finally take possession of her, albeit not in her human form.

Regardless of who occupies what role in the epinician paradigm, Ovid's manipulation of it raises questions regarding its presentation in Pindar. Daphne's "compensation" for her ordeal or her "integration" into civilized society is certainly violent and disturbing.[52] Although Daphne seems to consent by nodding, *adnuit* (*Met.* 1.567), Ovid lends an element of uncertainty to her consent with a passive form of *video*, *utque caput uisa est agitasse cacumen* (*Met.* 1.567).[53] Ovid further plays upon this ambiguity in his transition from Daphne's transformation to the Io episode. When the rivers come together to support Peneus after Daphne's metamorphosis, they are unsure whether to congratulate or console him, *conueniunt illuc popularia flumina primum*, / *nescia gratentur consolenturne parentem* (*Met.* 1.577–578). On the one hand, Daphne will receive fame and glory that she would have otherwise not possessed had Apollo not aggressively pursued her. On the other hand, the transformation strips Daphne of her human identity and even her name.

---

[52] Anderson 1995: *ad* 502–503 as well as Hardie 2002:262–263 note that Apollo's lust for Daphne resembles that of Tereus for Philomela in *Metamorphoses* 6 during his pursuit of Daphne, which emphasizes that this is not a typical footrace. For a more detailed analysis of the similarities between Apollo and Tereus, see Jacobson 1984.

[53] For more on the ambiguity of Daphne's body language here, see Ginsberg 1989:226–227. See also Farrell 1999:135–136.

These implicit motifs become explicit throughout the Apollo and Daphne episode, which has two effects. On the one hand, it furnishes the classic epinician paradigm with comedic elements. The image of Apollo, the god of poetry himself, reduced to a lovesick person who then becomes locked in passionate embrace with a tree is patently humorous. However, Daphne's unwillingness and her horrific transformation into a tree add darker elements to the myth. Whence this darkness? Is it purely an innovation on Ovid's part, or does Ovid perhaps emphasize the more disturbing aspects of *Pythian* 9?

## The Dark Side of Integration: Violence, Vegetation, and the Female Body

Vegetation occurs frequently throughout *Pythian* 9 and the Apollo and Daphne episode and is key to understanding the darker aspects of both myths. Pindar describes both Cyrene's "marriage" and Alexidamus' marriage with vegetal imagery in *Pythian* 9, and Daphne's transformation into the laurel tree is the purpose of the myth in the *Metamorphoses* (*nondum laurus erat*, *Met*. 1.450). Ovid takes great care to show exactly how Daphne's body parts become various parts of the laurel tree, *in frondem crines, in ramos bracchia crescunt* (*Met*. 1.550). As mentioned in the previous section, Daphne's desperate metamorphosis features sexual violence that casts doubt on the adequacy of her compensation for such an ordeal. *Pythian* 9, however, is not devoid of similarly violent features. Although Pindar is not as explicit as Ovid in his use of vegetal imagery with respect to Cyrene, it nevertheless occurs frequently

throughout *Pythian* 9.[54] Ovid highlights the implied violence in Pindar's use of vegetation within the Apollo and Daphne episode. In the process, he not only underscores the differences in the establishment of Rome and the city of Cyrene but also casts doubt on the seemingly peaceful and joyous nature of the relationship between Cyrene and Apollo in *Pythian* 9.

*Pythian* 9 not only includes plant imagery but also features the language of cultivation and harvesting in Pindar's description of Apollo's romance with Cyrene. The first instance in which this occurs is in the first several lines of the poem:

τὰν ὁ χαιτάεις ἀνεμοσφαράγων
ἐκ Παλίου κόλπων ποτὲ Λατοΐδας
ἄρπασ', ἔνεικέ τε χρυσέῳ παρθένον ἀγ'ροτέραν
δίφ'ρῳ, τόθι νιν πολυμήλου
καὶ πολυκαρποτάτας θῆκε δέσποιναν χθονός
ῥίζαν ἀπείρου τρίταν εὐ-
ήρατον θάλλοισαν οἰκεῖν.

*Pythian* 9.5–8

whom the long-haired son of Leto
once seized from the wind-echoing folds of Pelion
and brought the virgin huntress in his golden
chariot to a place where he made her mistress
of a land rich in flocks and abounding in fruit,
to inhabit the lovely and flourishing
root of the third continent.

[54] Carson 1982:125–126.

Pindar first describes the land of Cyrene itself as being rich in fruit, πολυκαρποτάτας (*Pyth.* 9.7) and then goes on to say that Apollo installs Cyrene in a flourishing garden, ῥίζαν … θάλλοισαν (*Pyth.* 9.8). Apollo has taken Cyrene, a not entirely civilized maiden, παρθένον ἀγροτέραν (*Pyth.* 9.5) from the wilderness, and has placed her in a garden (the city which will eventually become Cyrene) so that she can "bloom" in a more civilized setting.[55] Pindar also uses a form of ἁρπάζω with ἅρπασ' (*Pyth.* 9.6), which means "to plunder" or "to snatch" and has aggressive connotations, to describe how Apollo brings Cyrene to Libya.[56] This association between violence and vegetation continues when Pindar next mentions Apollo.

Apollo himself first uses plant-related language while asking Chiron about Cyrene's origins and then subsequently describes his intentions regarding Cyrene with vegetal euphemisms.

> τίς νιν ἀνθρώπων τέκεν; ποί-
> ας δ' ἀποσπασθεῖσα φύτλας
> ὀρέων κευθμῶνας ἔχει σκιοέντων,
> γεύεται δ' ἀλκᾶς ἀπειράντου;
> ὁσία κλυτὰν χέρα οἱ προσενεγκεῖν
> ἦρα καὶ ἐκ λεχέων κεῖραι μελιαδέα ποίαν;
>
> *Pythian* 9.32–36

[55] Carson 1982:128.

[56] Winnington-Ingram 1969:9 notes the violent aspects of this verb and comments that "ἅρπασ' (6) suggests violence—and violence upon a virgin (παρθένον ἀγροτέραν)." Woodbury 1972:565 and Carey 1981: *ad loc*. disagree. Cary states, "The verb implies no more than lust; the balance is righted in vv 12–13."

What mortal bore her? From what stock
has she been severed
that she lives in the glens of the shadowy mountains
and puts to the test her unbounded valor?
Is it right to lay my famous hand upon her
and indeed to reap the honey-sweet flower from the bed
of love?"

After inquiring about her parents, Apollo then asks which stock, φύτλας (*Pyth.* 9.33), Cyrene has been torn from, ἀποσπασθεῖσα (*Pyth.* 9.36). Kirkwood notes that φύτλας (*Pyth.* 9.33) is an atypical way to describe someone's lineage, "φύτλα is a rather unusual word (P. uses it also at *O.* 9.55), equivalent to γένος but by its derivation stressing the idea of growing things, 'stock,' as of a plant, rather than 'clan,' 'family.'"[57] Apollo does not regard Cyrene as a human being when he first sees her; rather, he seems to view her as an exotic plant. This becomes more evident in his next question to Chiron. Apollo asks if it is permitted for him to "harvest" or "reap," κεῖραι (*Pyth.* 9.36), the honey-sweet grass, μελιαδέα ποίαν (*Pyth.* 9.36), i.e., Cyrene's nether regions, from the bed, ἐκ λεχέων (*Pyth.* 9.36). His use of the verb κείρω with κεῖραι (*Pyth.* 9.36), makes the sexual violence more explicit and relates it to gardening, since κείρω means "to cut down," "consume," or "harvest".[58] This combination of plant imagery and violent verbal action continues from the opening lines of the poem, and some have agreed that Apollo's intent here is to rape Cyrene, rather than the actual marriage subsequently suggested

[57] Kirkwood 1982: *ad loc*. Burton 1962:44 and Woodbury 1982:252 also note the weirdness of this phrase.

[58] LSJ s.v.

by Chiron.[59] The infinitive προσενεγκεῖν (*Pyth.* 9.35), from προσφέρω, apart from meaning "to carry off" can also mean "to attack."[60] In this passage, Apollo sees Cyrene's body not only as vegetation, but vegetation that he desires to harvest.[61]

In his response to Apollo's question, Chiron first emphasizes that Apollo will actually marry Cyrene and then uses more language related to plants to describe how she will flourish in the city which will bear her name.

> ἐρέω· ταύτᾳ πόσις ἵκεο βᾶσσαν
> τάνδε, καὶ μέλλεις ὑπὲρ πόντου
> Διὸς ἔξοχον ποτὶ κᾶπον ἐνεῖκαι·
> ἔνθα νιν ἀρχέπολιν θήσεις, ἐπὶ λαὸν ἀγείραις
> νασιώταν ὄχθον ἐς ἀμφίπεδον·
> νῦν δ' εὐρυλείμων πότ'νιά σοι Λιβύα
> δέξεται εὐκλέα νύμφαν δώμασιν ἐν χρυσέοις
> πρόφ'ρων· ἵνα οἱ χθονὸς αἶσαν
> αὐτίκα συντελέθειν ἔννομον δωρήσεται
> οὔτε παγκάρπων φυτῶν νά-
> ποινον οὔτ' ἀγνῶτα θηρῶν.
>
> *Pythian* 9.51–58

> I will speak. You have come to this glen to be her
> husband, and you are about to take her over the sea
> to the finest garden of Zeus,
> where you will make her ruler of a city, after gathering
> an island people to the hill on the plain.

---

[59] For rape implications, see Winnington-Ingram 1969:10. Woodbury 1972:564–565, Carey 1981: *ad loc*., and Kirkwood 1982: *ad* 12 see nothing untoward in Apollo's intentions towards Cyrene.

[60] LSJ s.v.

[61] Cf. Archilochus' description of his love interest's nether regions as "grassy gardens" ποηφόρους κήπους in lines 14–15 of the Cologne Epode (fr. 196 West).

But as for now, Libya, mistress of broad meadows,
will welcome your famous bride in her golden palace
with gladness, and there at once she will grant her
a portion of land to hold as her lawful possession,
one neither devoid of plants rich in every fruit,
nor unacquainted with wild animals.

Though Chiron encourages Apollo to legitimately marry Cyrene, πόσις ἵκεο (*Pyth.* 9.51), he echoes Apollo's use of plant metaphors from his initial question. Apollo will bring Cyrene to a garden, κᾶπον (*Pyth.* 9.53), and several lines later Chiron describes the portion of land on which Cyrene will be built as fruitful and filled with wild animals, οὔτε παγκάρπων φυτῶν νάποινον οὔτ' ἀγνῶτα θηρῶν (*Pyth.* 9.58). Cyrene thus becomes an exotic plant, which Apollo finds in the woods, βᾶσσαν (*Pyth.* 9.51), and then relocates her from the wilderness into a garden—a more domestic setting.

Vegetal imagery occurs again at the end of *Pythian* 9 during Pindar's description of the races that result in marriage and the ceremony at the end. Pindar states that the suitors of Antaeus' daughter wanted to "harvest her fruits," χρυσοστεφάνου δέ οἱ Ἴβας / καρπὸν ἀνθήσαντ' ἀποδρέψαι / ἔθελον (*Pyth.* 9.109–110), which is most likely a euphemism for her viginity. All of the vegetal imagery throughout the poem culminates in Pindar's description of the *phullobolia* or the ceremony in which victors were showered with leaves.[62] Carson argues that Pindar uses this ceremony to refer to the *kataschumata*, a ritual whereby the bride was

[62] Burton 1962:59, Carson 1982:126–127.

showered with leaves, figs, and other symbols of domesticity upon arriving at her new household which "formally and publicly made the strange bride part of her new house by mingling her with its fruits."[63] Thus, vegetation in *Pythian* 9 works as both a euphemism for parts of the female body as well as a symbol of integration of a bride or a victor into a community.

When we view Pindar's use of vegetation in the context of Daphne's transformation in the *Metamorphoses*, several things emerge. First, Ovid makes explicit the sexual violence implied by the much-debated ἐκ λεχέων κεῖραι μελιαδέα ποίαν (*Pyth.* 9.36) in the *Metamorphoses*. Unlike the Apollo of *Pythian* 9, Apollo in the *Metamorphoses* does not have the benefit of Chiron's advice nor does he seem to feel the *aidos* of his counterpart in *Pythian* 9 that prompts him to ask Chiron if he can act on his intentions towards Cyrene. Rather, Apollo in the *Metamorphoses* sees Daphne, immediately desires marriage, and then proceeds to pursue her after she flees. Daphne's transformation into the laurel can also be seen as a response to Pindar's *phullobolia* (and *kataschumata*, by extension) at the end of the ode. Rather than being merely sprinkled with leaves that one presumably brushes off after the ceremony, Daphne quite literally becomes covered with leaves and will exist in this state for the rest of her life. Moreover, Daphne will endure the sort of "plucking" or "harvesting" that was merely

[63] Carson 1982:127.

metaphorical in *Pythian* 9. In order to create the laurel garlands Apollo mentions, her leaves will have to be plucked from the tree in the same way that Apollo in *Pythian* 9 initially desires to pluck Cyrene's "honey-sweet grass."[64] Ovid thus incorporates the sexual violence implied by Pindar's use of vegetal imagery and makes it explicit in his refashioning of the myth.

This latent violence also casts some doubts on the nature of Cyrene's establishment in Cyrene. Unlike the Apollo and Daphne episode, in which Ovid describes Daphne's state of mind and quotes her directly until she can no longer physically speak, Pindar never quotes Cyrene and never relates her state of mind to the reader (or audience, rather). We only see Cyrene through Apollo's eyes in a rather voyeuristic manner, and she never has the chance to say how she feels about her abduction at the hands of Apollo. Most tend to think that Cyrene is quite fortunate here to have "won" a husband; however, Cyrene herself lacks a voice.[65] Daphne resembles Cyrene in her inability to speak after becoming a tree. The only way she can express assent with Apollo's speech following her transformation is to nod her newly formed boughs of leaves, and Ovid complicates whether or not she truly assents by including *uisa*, *factis modo laurea ramis / adnuit utque caput uisa est agitasse cacumen* (*Met*. 1.566–567).[66] By depicting

[64] Hardie 2002:48–49.

[65] Woodbury 1972, Robbins 1978.

[66] Incidentally, Fränkel 1945:78 describes Daphne as "a fine but frigid plant."

Daphne's literal metamorphosis into vegetation and emphasizing her loss of speech, Ovid makes explicit that which Pindar implies about Cyrene in *Pythian* 9.

Apart from highlighting some of the more sexually violent aspects of *Pythian* 9 within the Apollo and Daphne episode, Ovid also emphasizes the contrast between the end result of Cyrene's interaction with Apollo and that of Daphne. Once Apollo leaves Cyrene in *Pythian* 9, she has been established as the ruler of a city and then gives birth to Aristaeus who eventually becomes immortal (*Pyth.* 9.59–65). Daphne, on the other hand, must spend the rest of her life as a tree and retains nothing of her previous existence.[67] Her only consolation comes from being not just any tree, but Apollo's personal tree and thus being linked with him for eternity. She does not even receive the potential benefits of marriage to Apollo. The question remains, though—does the fame and glory gained from being associated with a god sufficiently compensate one for death or loss of humanity? As mentioned previously, Ovid highlights this ambiguity by describing the ambivalent reaction of Peneus' fellow rivers after Daphne's metamorphosis.[68]

When we examine Daphne's metamorphosis into a tree in the context of *Pythian* 9 and the vegetal imagery used to describe Cyrene throughout, we find that Ovid engages with

[67] Feldherr 2002:172 comments, "Indeed if anything has been preserved of Daphne it is the tragic discrepancy between her inner will and outer appearance."

[68] Fränkel 1945:78–79 mentions the ambiguity, but attributes it to Ovid's "natural propensity to undecisive compromises."

Pindar's plants in order to highlight the differences in the way in which the Apollo of *Pythian* 9 "plants" Cyrene in the self-same city and the Apollo of the *Metamorphoses* says that Daphne will adorn the Temple of Apollo on the Palatine in Rome. As mentioned above, Pindar and emphasizes that after Apollo "plants" her in Cyrene, she will produce offspring. Daphne, however, maintains her eternal virginity and will never produce children. Rather than being allowed to flourish and produce offspring which will then provide her with *kleos* similar to that enjoyed by Cyrene, her *kleos* will only come from her association with Apollo and Augustan Rome.

## Cupid, *Saeva Ira*, and Augustan Rome

What does Ovid accomplish by problematizing the events of *Pythian* 9? How does bringing the more violent aspects of integrating the victor to the forefront of the Apollo and Daphne episode with an emphasis on vegetation function within the larger context of the *Metamorphoses*?

In order to determine the broader effects of reading the Apollo and Daphne episode through the lens of *Pythian* 9, we must examine another common thread in both texts—references to a currently existing nation-state. Pindar includes Apollo's marriage to Cyrene in *Pythian* 9 so that he can tell the founding myth of the city Cyrene, Telesicrates' hometown. Though Ovid does not directly discuss the founding of Rome during the Apollo and Daphne

episode, he explicitly mentions Augustan Rome in Apollo's speech to Daphne following her transformation. Apollo describes how her foliage will adorn the door of Temple of Apollo on the Palatine (*Met.* 1.560–563).[69] Augustus' relationship with both Cupid and Apollo further complicates the situation. The *saeua Cupidinis ira* (*Met.* 1.453) in response to Apollo's boasting sets in motion the situation that leads to Daphne's metamorphosis. Augustus associated himself with Apollo as well, particularly after his victory at Actium, and even used the Temple of Apollo to conduct governmental business.[70] Moreover, Ovid's use of *saeua ira* programmatically recalls the opening of Virgil's *Aeneid* and Roman national history by extension. Though the temporal perspectives differ since Pindar is looking back to mythical time from the present, and Ovid is looking ahead *ad mea tempora* from mythical time, they both discuss the founding of a city or the beginning of an era in an empire. Ovid draws out the violence of the myth in *Pythian* 9 in order to highlight similar aspects of the Augustan era in Rome, which lends anti-Augustan implications to the Apollo and Daphne episode.

Apollo's pride after defeating the Python and after founding the Pythian games provokes Cupid's wrath, as Ovid emphasizes:

> primus amor Phoebi Daphne Peneia, quem non
> fors ignara dedit, sed saeua Cupidinis ira.

---

[69] Hollis 1996:73 interprets the oak tree here as a "veiled compliment to Augustus." I argue against this interpretation.

[70] Zanker 1988:85–93. See also Miller 2005:171.

*Metamorphoses* 1.452–453

> Now the first love of Phoebus was Daphne, daughter of Peneus,
> the river-god. It was no blind chance that gave this love,
> but the malicious wrath of Cupid.

Before relating the quarrel between Cupid and Apollo that instigates the episode, Ovid tells us that the reason for Daphne being Apollo's *primus amor* is the *saeua Cupidinis ira*, which recalls *saeuae memorem Iunonis ob iram* (*Aen.* 1.4) from the opening of Virgil's *Aeneid*. Not only does Ovid allude to the proem of the *Aeneid*, he also alludes to the second proem in *Aeneid* 7. Ovid's use of a relative pronoun, *fors*, and *dedit*, echoes *quae fors prima dedit sanguis noua imbuit arma* (*Aen.* 7.554).[71] Some have interpreted Ovid's allusions to Virgil in this line as having a comic effect that gives the entire episode a mock-epic tone.[72] However, if we examine this allusion in light of the violence of *Pythian* 9 and take a darker interpretive approach to the *Aeneid*, portraying Daphne as the victim of Cupid's *saeua ira* places her in the same realm as Dido or the other characters of the *Aeneid* whose sufferings are, in effect, collateral damage both from squabbles among deities and from the impetus to found what will eventually become Rome.[73] Putnam comments as well that Apollo's pursuit of Daphne recalls Aeneas' pursuit of Turnus in *Aeneid* 12

[71] Miller 2009:171.

[72] Savage 1943:246, Miller 2009:170.

[73] For more on negative aspects of the gods in the *Metamorphoses*, see Anderson 1995 *passim*. For more on subversive interpretations of the *Aeneid* see Parry 1963, Clausen 1964, Putnam 1965, Johnson 1987, Lyne 1987, Thomas 1982:93–107 among others.

and describes Daphne as "the defeated without whom victory cannot take place."[74] Just as Cyrene's removal from the wilderness to the city Cyrene forms a crucial part of the founding myth of Cyrene, so too does Daphne's defeat and appropriation by Apollo contribute to the development of an important symbol in Augustan Rome.

The second allusion to Rome and Augustus occurs at the end of the episode during Apollo's "praise poem" of sorts to Daphne after she undergoes her transformation.

> tu ducibus Latiis aderis, cum laeta Triumphum
> uox canet et uisent longas Capitolia pompas;
> postibus Augustis eadem fidissima custos
> ante fores stabis mediamque tuebere quercum,
> utque meum intonsis caput est iuuenale capillis,
> tu quoque perpetuos semper gere frondis honores.
>
> *Metamorphoses* 1.560–565

> With thee
> shall Roman generals wreathe their heads, when shouts of joy
> shall acclaim their triumph, and long processions climb the
> Capitol. Thou at Augustus' portals shalt stand a trusty guardian,
> and keep watch over the civic crown of
> oak which hangs between. And as my head is ever young and my
> locks unshorn, so do thou keep the beauty of thy leaves
> perpetual.

[74] Putnam 2005:77–80.

As many have noted, Apollo describes the Temple of Apollo located on the Palatine which was adjacent to his own home.[75] The two laurel bushes that Apollo mentions were placed on either side of the doors of the temple in 27 BC, and Augustus essentially appropriated the laurel as his personal symbol by having them flank his house.[76] As Putnam comments, "Daphne, his victim, through her agonizing loss of selfhood becomes a symbol of the city's compulsive victorious martiality."[77] Daphne, therefore, becomes a sacrifice for the establishment of a symbol of Rome and Augustus.

The aspects of *Ktissisagen* in *Pythian* 9 combined with Augustan Rome in this episode in order depicts the effects of empire building on innocent bystanders. Daphne becomes a symbol of Rome by means of her brutal transformation. Thus, in order to fully make sense of this episode, we need to view the story of the founding of Cyrene and its relationship to the Apollo and Daphne episode in light of the ambivalent treatment given to Rome's founding by Virgil in the *Aeneid*. Contrasting Cyrene's fate with Daphne's highlights the brutality inherent in Rome's founding and its victims.

## Conclusion

[75] Anderson 1995: *ad* 560–561 thinks mentioning the *ducibus Latiis* (*Met.* 1.560) as a result of Heinsius' conjecture "fits with Ovid's tendency to Latinize Greek myths." Needless to say, I think there is deeper significance to the allusion.

[76] Anderson 1995: *ad* 562–563.

[77] Putnam 2005:72.

As we have seen, reading Pindar's *Pythian* 9 alongside the Apollo and Daphne episode has a variety of effects. On a purely literary level, it parodies and problematizes the principles of the genre of epinician poetry, but also highlights the latent violence in Pindar's use of vegetal imagery. As we shall see in the following chapter, the underlying paradigms of praise poetry in order draw attention to problematic aspects of Augustan Rome.

# Chapter 2
# I Find Your Lack of Faith Disturbing: Praise, Blame, and *Pythian* 2 in the Lycaon Episode

## Introduction

Lycaon's sudden transformation into a wolf in *Metamorphoses* 1 has been the focus of scholarly attention primarily as a result of its programmatic placement within the *Metamorphoses* and Ovid's portrayal of Jupiter as a figure who bears an uncanny resemblance to Augustus. Indeed, Lycaon is the first metamorphosis in the *Metamorphoses*, and one cannot ignore the fact that Jupiter recounts his journey to the mortal realm and Lycaon's transformation to the *concilium deorum* in a place that Ovid describes as the *Palatia caeli* (*Met.* 1.176).[78] Ovid's deviation from epic norms in his portrayal of Jupiter, the *concilium deorum* with which the episode opens, and Lycaon's transformation all call the episode's generic identity into question. Rather than exhibiting the detached sort of grandeur typically associated with the deity who maintains order throughout the cosmos, Jupiter comes across as angry and petulant, especially when he seeks to eliminate the entire human race as a result of Lycaon's transgressions. If Jupiter's account of events is accurate, Lycaon does commit several acts that are certainly *nefas* and violations of the sacred concept of *xenia*, namely attempting to kill Jupiter and then serving him human flesh for dinner. However, Jupiter's reaction responding by destroying all of

[78] See, e.g., Otis 1966:100, Anderson 1989, Ginsberg 1989:228–230, Feeney 1991:199, Anderson 1995: *ad* 168, Segal 1998:404–405, Segal 2001:80ff., Feldherr 2002:169–172.

humanity seems rather extreme and out of character for the *rex hominum deorumque* whom we see in Homer and Virgil.[79]

Jupiter's intense anger, the manner in which he recounts the incident to his fellow deities, and Lycaon's violations of *xenia* bring to mind the primary features of two literary genres that function according to the paradigms of exchange rituals—iambic and epinician poetry or blame poetry and praise poetry.[80] A central feature of iambic poetry is that it consists of invective against an individual who represents a particular class of people performed before the poet's social milieu.[81] In this reading, Jupiter takes on the role of an iambic poet who recounts to his circle of peers how he has been wronged by Lycaon and his subsequent vengeance. Jupiter's narration of the injustices he has suffered at the hands of Lycaon to an audience of his peers and the fact that Lycaon eventually becomes a scapegoat for the entire human race corresponds to the properties of iambic poetry. Unlike most iambic poets, Jupiter has divine powers and is not limited to seeking vengeance through purely literary means; rather, he subsequently destroys all of humanity. Lycaon turns into his etymological

[79] Griffin 1992:40–41 thinks Jupiter acts "biblically" and is completely justified in his actions.

[80] Dumézil 1943.

[81] West 1974:27, Nagy 1999:245–252, Acosta-Hughes 2002:205ff., Rotstein 2012:120ff.

counterpart: a *lykos* or wolf—the symbolic outcast and committer of social taboos in Indo-European literature.[82]

Pindar's *Pythian* 2 provides more information about the role of Archilochus, iambic poetry, and, most importantly, wolves. Throughout *Pythian* 2, Pindar discusses violations of *xenia* and specifically mentions the way in which Archilochus fattens himself on invective (*Pyth.* 2.54–56), and wolves (*Pyth.* 2.83–85), all of which have connections to the Lycaon episode in the *Metamorphoses*. Indeed, Lycaon is etymologically related to Lycambes, the target of Archilochus' iambic invective as a result of having broken off the marriage of one of his daughters to Archilochus and violating *xenia* in that way.[83] Though whether Lycambes himself actually existed or was just a literary representation of a class of people is debatable, Archilochus nonetheless refers to a violation of *xenia*. At the conclusion of the ode, Pindar describes how one must engage in "wolf-walking" down twisted roads while encountering an enemy, which also relates to Lycambes and iambic poetry (*Pyth.* 2.83–85). Many have debated Pindar's use of animalistic imagery, relationship to Archilochus, and Pindar's reference to "wolf walking" in this text.[84] If we think about Lycaon's metamorphosis in this context, Lycaon

[82] For more on wolves in Greek literature see Eisner 1952 and Gernet 1981:126–128. See also Burkert 1983:84–90 for more on Arcadia and wolves.

[83] See West 1974:26–27 as well as Carey 1981:153–155 for more on the conflict between Archilochus and Lycambes.

[84] For the major discussions on *Pythian* 2, see Bowra 1937, Carey 1981, Kirkwood 1984, Most 1985, Bell 1994, Brown 2006, Hawkins 2008, and Steiner 2011. For blame poetry and Archilochus, Kurke 1991:100–101, Miller 1994:22ff., Rotstein 2010. For more on praise and blame in epic see Nagy 1979:222–264.

literally becomes the wolfish outcast who has no home. Even the way in which Jupiter describes him after his transformation resembles the turning movements of the "wolf-stepping" dance, *vertitur in pecudes* (*Met*. 1.253).[85] When we read *Pythian* 2 and the conventions of iambic poetry in the context of the *Metamorphoses*, we see that Ovid places the conventions of a literary genre in a (more or less) "real-life" situation.

Since much of iambic poetry both in the archaic and Hellenistic periods is annoyingly fragmentary, it would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to argue that Ovid's Lycaon is a direct intertextual allusion to a specific iambic poem. Moreover, as Anderson et al have noted, Ovid's source for the Lycaon episode is unclear.[86] The story appears in Hesiod *fr*. 180C, Hyginus *Fab*. 176, and Apollodorus 3.8.1, but Ovid's version of the story differs from all three in one crucial aspect. Jupiter in his version of events omits the part of the myth in which he rapes Callisto, Lycaon's daughter, which could not only explain but also justify Lycaon's actions.[87] That said, reading the episode through the opposing poles of praise and blame poetry with an eye to the Lycaon-Lycambes connection does provide some answers as to why Ovid's Jupiter is vastly different from Zeus in Homer and Jupiter in Virgil. Jupiter does take measures to maintain order in the cosmos in other epics; however, in *Metamorphoses* 1 Ovid portrays him as

[85] Pickard-Cambridge 1927:15 and Nagy 1979:242 for more on wolf stepping.

[86] Bömer 1969:70ff., Anderson 1989:5.

[87] Anderson 1989:96 also notices this.

a vengeful blame poet rather than an impassive, removed deity. In the process, Ovid not only parodies the conventions of iambic poetry by putting it in a real-life situation just as in *Amores* 3.1 and the Apollo and Daphne episode (*Met.* 1.452–567) but also raises questions regarding the power of an iambic poet. What happens when the person delivering invective is not merely someone who is content with simply writing or performing it, such as Archilochus or Hipponax, but someone who can actually eliminate the *ekhthros* from society, e.g. Jupiter or even Augustus? In this chapter, I shall discuss the consequences of poetic power by first exploring the relationship between Jupiter and his audience in the context of the relationship between an iambic poet and his audience and then by focusing on Lycaon's role as the target of Jupiter's invective.

## Iambic Poetry and Generic Difficulties

Before we begin a discussion of how Ovid works with the dichotomy of praise and blame poetry throughout the Lycaon episode, we should devote some attention to the generic conventions of iambic poetry and the difficulties that arise when attempting to outline them.[88] Defining the parameters of iambic poetry as a genre presents complications simply because of the limited and fragmentary sample size we posses today. Archilochus, who appears to be the primary poet for iambic invective, survives only in fragments, as do Hipponax and Semonides.

[88] See West 1974:20ff., Nagy 1979:243–252

Although there are quite a number of surviving fragments of Callimachus' iambic poems, they are just that—fragments. Moreover, these fragments vary greatly with regard to their subject matter, which complicates matters even more. Using meter as the defining characteristic of the genre becomes problematic as well, because as West and Dover among others have noted, some of Archilochus' fragments written in elegiacs deal with similar themes as those in iambs.[89]

Nonetheless, several scholars have identified common characteristics of iambic poetry and have come to some agreement regarding its origins. Invective would seem to be the defining characteristic of iambic poetry. Indeed, the word iamb itself derives from ἰαμβίζω and/or ἰὸν βάζειν, which refer to attacking and slandering, as well as Ares' son Iambos, who threw the javelin and would yell while doing so.[90] Javelin throwers also alternate between longer and shorter steps before releasing the javelin, which resembles the long and short syllables in an iamb.[91] Most agree at some level that iambic poetry is somehow related to Iambe, the character in the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* who distracts Demeter with jests and insults while she worries about Persephone. From this origin, insults became a part of rituals

[89] Dover 1964:181, West 1974:23.

[90] See also Barchiesi 2002:51–52, Rotstein 2010:119–124.

[91] Rotstein 2010:123 in which she discusses Diomedes, *de poematibus*. For a modern example of how javelin throwers step and shout, especially right before they release the javelin, see Julius Yego's gold medal throw at the 2015 IAAF World Championships in Beijing: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Gh3D7ibDIpU

celebrating Demeter and then somehow became involved with Dionysiac rites.[92] Ancient testimonia also characterize Archilochus along with Hipponax as the primary blame poets in archaic times.[93] Callimachus, Meleager, and the Hellenistic poets who composed iambs use dog-like language related to consumption to describe the invective of Archilochus.[94] According to Acosta-Hughes, iambic discourse is "a type of poetic utterance at once ethical, in that it may serve as a medium for the criticism or shaming of another (*psogos* or "blame" poetry), and coarse or low, in that it embodies a realm wherein elements of diction, theme, or imagery that are normally excluded from more elevated poetic forms (e.g. elegy) are very much at home."[95] In other words, the first-person narrator of iambic poetry adopts a rather preachy, didactic tone and uses base imagery related to lower literary genres. Yet even Acosta-Hughes acknowledges the wide variety of iambic poems by noting the multiplicity of themes that abound in Callimachus' iambic corpus.[96] The one constant, however, is invective of some sort as well as the use of lower, more base themes than what is typically found in more elevated literary genres, e.g. animal fables, etc. In addition to the subject matter, West points out that iambic poetry is typically a "poetic monologue" that does have some direct speech; however

[92] Barchiesi 2002:51–52, Rotstein 2010:122.

[93] E.g. Dio. Chrys. 33.11–12, Dioscorides (Palatine Anthology 7.351), Meleagar? (PA 7.352).

[94] E.g. Callimachus *fr*. 380.

[95] Acosta-Hughes 2002:2. For more on whether the targets of invective were actual people or literary constructs, see Nagy 1979:246ff. as well as Dover 1964, and Rosen 1988.

[96] Acosta-Hughes 2002:8–9.

"it is clear that they are reported by a narrator."[97] Aristotle identifies a major division between praise and invective poetry in the *Poetics* and comments that elevated poetic genres, namely epic, developed from poetry that imitated noble people (e.g. praise poetry) and that "lower" poetic genres, namely comedy, etc., developed from poetry that imitated and blamed base people (*Poetics* 1448b25–30).[98] Though some have taken issue with Aristotle's possible oversimplification of the development of epic,[99] it is worth noting that the first division when classifying poetic genres is between praise and blame poetry.

It is perhaps also useful to consider iambic poetry from the point of view of its opposite—praise poetry. Both Pindar and Bacchylides criticize Archilochus, especially with regard to his invective with discourse involving consumption and food. The most salient example of this is, obviously, *Pythian* 2 in which Pindar makes a special effort to attack Archilochus and blame poetry writ large midway through the ode.

> εἶδον γὰρ ἑκὰς ἐὼν τὰ πόλλ' ἐν ἀμαχανίᾳ
> ψογερὸν Ἀρχίλοχον βαρυλόγοις ἔχθεσιν
> πιαινόμενον· τὸ πλουτεῖν δὲ σὺν τύχᾳ
> πότ'μου σοφίας ἄριστον.
>
> *Pythian* 2.54–56

For standing at a far remove I have seen

[97] West 1974:32. See also Dover 1964:186ff., Nagy 1976 as well as Rotstein 2010:62.

[98] For more on Aristotle and iambic poetry, see West and Nagy above as well as Rotstein 2010:61–108.

[99] Nagy 1979:243ff.

Archilochus the blamer often in straits as he fed on
dire words of hatred. And possessing wealth that is
granted by destiny is the best object of wisdom.

Pindar states that he has seen hateful Archilochus fattening himself on hateful words, ψογερὸν Ἀρχίλοχον βαρυλόγοις ἔχθεσιν / πιαινόμενον (*Pyth.* 2.55–56). Invective poetry is thus linked closely with improper and excessive consumption.[100] He then compares Archilochus' isolated and impoverished state to his own much healthier state of being. Kurke comments that invective poetry ultimately isolates both the poet and the target of invective, whereas the *laudator* seeks to reintegrate his *laudandus* back into the community.[101] Blame poetry divides a community, whereas praise poetry strengthens the bonds that hold it together.[102] Pindar further intensifies this principle at the end of *Nemean* 7 when he specifically describes his role as a praise poet as a *xenos*.

ξεῖνός εἰμι· <σκ>οτεινὸν ἀπέχων ψόγον,
ὕδατος ὥτε ῥοὰς φίλον ἐς ἄνδρ' ἄγων
κλέος ἐτήτυμον αἰνέσω·

*Nemean* 7.61–63

I am a guest-friend. Keeping away dark blame,
like streams of water I shall bring genuine fame
with my praises to the man who is my friend ...

[100] See also Nagy 1979:224–226 for more on blame and gluttony.

[101] Kurke 1991:100.

[102] Ibid.

Bacchylides uses similar language when describing *phthonos* in his third epinician ode, [μ]ὴ φθόνῳ πιαίνεται (3.68). Improper (and excessive) consumption and blame go hand in hand. The role of a praise poet and the role of a good *xenos* would seem to be synonymous, whereas the blame poet is a bad *xenos* or an enemy. If we think about this in terms of praise poetry's relationship to *xenia* and proper adherence to exchange rituals,[103] then blame poetry would seem to be its opposite—improper performance of exchange rituals which then leads to terrible things.

In Latin literature, Lucilius, Catullus, and Horace all wrote iambic verses. Catullus never mentions Archilochus, but does refer to iambs as signaling invective in at least one fragment and certainly delivers in that regard.[104] Of these three, Horace is the one that concerns us most. Horace himself certainly believes that he was the first Latin iambic poet, as he tells us in *Epistles* 1.19.24ff. However, he did not see himself as having adopted the same vitriolic invective that we see in Archilochus, but rather as combining it with a Callimachean aesthetic and adapting it to his contemporary times, as he also tells us in *Epistles* 1.19.[105] In the *Ars Poetica*, Horace describes rage as having equipped Archilochus with iambs as weapons, *Archilochum proprio rabies armavit iambo* (*Ars P* 79). By contrast, Horace's aim as an iambic poet is

[103] See Kurke 1991:135–158.

[104] See Heyworth 2001:117–140 for more on Catullan iambic and the complications therein. Heyworth comments that all of the poems in which Catullus refers to iambs are in hendecasyables and that the twelve poems in iambic meters vary with regard to their content.

[105] Mankin 1995:7–8, Watson 2000:6–7, Barchiesi 2002:61–62, Johnson 2012:6–9. See also Barchiesi 2001:141–162.

perhaps not to destroy a particular enemy but rather to critique the relationships between people.[106] Indeed, Horace's *Epodes* feature a wide variety of subjects from political commentary to his relationship with Maecenas to the rather grotesque figure of Canidia. As Johnson comments, "By exposing the tensions in the competing perspectives and bringing them into association, Horace's iambic criticism from first to last (*Epodes*, *Odes*, *Ars Poetica*) does the work of social reconstruction (transgression, responsion, fusion)."[107] Horace seems to combine archaic and Hellenistic iambic poetry into something more suited to Augustan Rome.

Ovid himself dabbled in iambic poetry later in his career with the *Ibis*, which he wrote while in exile. Most place the date of the *Ibis*' composition at some point after the *Tristia* between 10 and 12 CE.[108] Although Ovid writes in elegiac couplets rather than iambs, he explicitly states that this is invective poetry and that he is following in the tradition of Archilochus and Callimachus (*Ib*. 53–57). Indeed, Ovid perhaps outdoes all of his iambic predecessors with a torrent of unceasing invective for several hundred lines. Needless to say, as one would expect, Ovid makes use of all the conventions of iambic poetry. However, since it was written after the *Metamorphoses*, I do not intend to refer to it throughout my discussion of the Lycaon episode.

---

[106] Johnson 2012:10–12.

[107] Johnson 2012:29.

[108] Syme 1978:38 thinks Ovid wrote the poem in 10 CE. See Leary 1990 for a more thorough discussion of the *Ibis*' dating. For a more comprehensive analysis of the *Ibis* and its place in the Ovidian corpus, see Williams 1996.

## Jupiter and the *Concilium Deorum*: Poet, Audience, and Invective

As mentioned in the introduction of this chapter, many people have discussed the rather undignified way in which Ovid portrays Jupiter and the *concilium deorum* in *Metamorphoses* 1 and how Ovid's depiction of Jupiter differs from the detached, omnipotent deity of the Homeric poems and the *Aeneid*. Anderson, Feeney and others have noted that Ovid's Jupiter behaves in a manner reminiscent of Juno in the *Aeneid.*[109] Ovid's description of Jupiter's reaction to his frenzied fellow deities, *Iuppiter hoc iterum sermone silentia rupit* (*Met.* 1.208) resembles Juno in *Aeneid* 10, *quid me alta silentia cogis / rumpere* (*Aen*. 10.63–64) which makes Jupiter seem more vengeful than omnipotent.[110] Even the first epithet Ovid uses when referring to Jupiter, *Saturnius* (*Met.* 1.163) recalls Juno's epithet in the *Aeneid*, *Saturnia*. Others have discussed Ovid's creative anachronism by referring to Mount Olympus as the Palatine of the Sky, *magni Palatia caeli* (*Met.* 1.176). Brooks Otis notes, "It is as if a modern American were to speak of God's 'White House' and Heaven's 'Pennsylvania Avenue' or a Briton to place the Last Judgment in a celestial Buckingham Palace."[111] Even the typically epic topoi that Ovid employs when describing Jupiter's hair distance him further from epic. Anderson comments that the frenzied way in which Jupiter shakes his hair, *terrificam capitis concussit terque quaterque* /

[109] Anderson 1989:90ff., Feeney 1991:200, Anderson 1995: *ad* 181, Segal 1998:406.

[110] Feeney 1991:201ff., Anderson 1995: *ad loc*.

[111] Otis 1966:98. See also Anderson 1989:93.

*caesariem cum qua terram mare sidera mouit* (*Met.* 1.179–180), causes him to seem more like a Maenad than the dignified way in which his hair moves in Homer.[112] By both depriving Jupiter of the remoteness and detachment that makes him seem elevated in a more typical epic context and bringing Olympus down to the level of Ovid's contemporary time, Ovid robs the scene of epic characteristics and evokes a tone more characteristic of a lower literary genre while ironically using a stock epic scene.[113] All of this, as Anderson comments, "generates a mixture of tone that is provocatively elusive."[114]

Bömer, however, is of the opinion that the *concilium deorum* Ovid depicts is completely epic and elevated in every way, "in dem Ovid, mit Vergil wetteifernd, Iuppiter mit aller Würde eine höchst majestätische Rolle spielen lasse."[115] However, others are more skeptical.[116] Since iambic poetry, like most other "lower" literary genres, concerns itself with everyday, contemporary life rather than the elevated themes common to epic and tragedy that occur in the mythical past, by taking an epic device such the *concilium deorum* and describing it in terms of something that was a part of everyday life in Rome, Ovid implicitly assimilates the gods to a lower literary genre and de-epicizes the episode.

---

[112] Bömer 1969: *ad loc.* sees it as an allusion to similar passages in Homer. See also Anderson 1989:94 and Anderson 1995: *ad loc.*

[113] Wilkinson 1955:195 comments that Jupiter in Ovid "lacks something of the remoteness that makes the Homeric gods impressive for all their escapades."

[114] Anderson 1995:168.

[115] Fraenkel 1945:75, Bömer 1969: *ad loc.*

[116] Wilkinson 1955:195, Anderson 1989:92–93, Feeney 1991:201.

After undermining the epic aspects of the episode, Ovid programmatically evokes some characteristics of invective poetry:

> ingemit et, facto nondum uulgata recenti
> foeda Lycaoniae referens conuiuia mensae,
> ingentes animo et dignas Ioue concipit iras
> conciliumque uocat; tenuit mora nulla uocatos.
>
> *Metamorphoses* 1.163–166

> ... he groaned
> and, recalling the infamous revels of
> Lycaon's table—a story still unknown because the deed was new—
> he conceived a mighty wrath worthy of the soul of Jove, and
> summoned a council of the gods. Naught delayed their answer to
> the summons.

He describes Jupiter groaning over Lycaon's deeds, which have not yet been made publicly known, *nondum uulgata* (*Met.* 1.162) Given that the verb *uulgo* and the noun/adjective derivations of it have rather pejorative connotations and can mean "base" or "common" apart from just "commonly known," Ovid perhaps recalls the base associations of iambic poetry.[117] The line *foeda Lycaoniae referens conuiuia mensae* (*Met.* 1.164) intensifies the associations of this episode with iambic poetry with *Lycaoniae mensae* (*Met.* 1.164). The target of the iambic poet's invective is usually someone who has violated exchange rituals (e.g., *xenia*, marriage rites, etc.) in some way, and Ovid looks ahead to Lycaon's dinner consisting of human flesh with *mensae*

[117] OLD s.v.

(*Met.* 1.164) As mentioned earlier, Lycambes provoked Archilochus' scorn and invective by breaking off an impending marriage with one of his daughters. All of this causes Jupiter to become angry, i*ngentes animo et dignas Ioue concipit iras* (*Met.* 1.166) In sum, we have the appropriate circumstances for an iambic poem: a violation of exchange rituals, an angry narrator, and a scapegoat.

The reaction of the other gods to Jupiter's narrative fits the profile of an iambic performance. Indeed, an iambic poet typically performs before an audience consisting of his social milieu and delivers invective against someone who has violated the principles of society.[118] The audience joins in the blaming and restores social order, but is also entertained.[119] Accordingly, the other Olympian deities react to Jupiter's narrative with outrage, *confremuere omnes studiisque ardentibus ausum / talia deposcunt*, and desire to join in the blaming to ensure that social order is restored. However, unlike in real life in which one would merely ridicule the target of invective, Jupiter and the other gods have the ability to obliterate the target of the invective himself and the social group he represents. As Anderson comments, "... the destruction of mankind is not a patently comic matter."[120]

## Lycaon, Lykambes, and Invective

[118] West 1974:32ff., Nagy 1979:243ff.

[119] Nagy 1979:243ff.

[120] Anderson 1995:168.

Lycaon's status as the focus of Jupiter's invective and his transformation into a wolf, traditionally a creature on the fringes of society, casts him in the role of an iambic poet's target.[121] The plot thickens when we consider the role of wolves and rituals in Arcadia. According to Pausanias, Lycaon was the son of Pelesagus who originally founded the settlement in Arcadia (8.1–3). After he allegedly sacrificed a baby on the altar of Zeus Lycaeus, he turned into a wolf, and in the following years, people would routinely turn into wolves in Arcadia. An initiation rite began at some point after Lycaon's initial transformation whereby men would turn into wolves for a period of time and then return as men. In *Republic* 8, Socrates mentions that a person ate human flesh during a sacrifice at sanctuary of Zeus Lycaeus (*Republic* 8.565d). Pausanias also comments that those who took part in rituals at this particular sanctuary often transformed into wolves and if they had eaten human flesh, the transformation was permanent (8.2.6). Pliny and Augustine also mention Arcadia's penchant for wolf transformations (*HN* 8.34 and *De civ. D* 2.18.17). Pausanias mentions that Lycaon sacrificed a baby on the altar and was subsequently made into a wolf. Burkert believes that all of this was part of initiation rituals in which the person who became a wolf was sent into the wilderness to survive and reemerged as an adult.[122] Regardless of whether one believes that

[121] For more on how wolves and wolfish things work in society in general, see Eisner 1952. Burkert 1972:84–90, Detienne and Svenbro 1989:148–163.

[122] Burkert 1983:90.

Arcadia was a breeding ground for actual werewolves, Lycaon is implicitly associated with Arcadia, wolves, and human sacrifice.[123]

Charles Segal argues that Ovid has a vested interest in taking the Arcadia of Virgil's *Eclogues* and transforming it into a dark, terrifying place where horrible things happen.[124] He comments that Ovid features "an Arcadia marked by the two most horrible crimes possible for mankind, human sacrifice and cannibalism."[125] If we take Ovid's undermining of Virgil's Arcadia and place it in the context of Jupiter's narrative, we see that Ovid further subverts Virgil. Lest we forget, Jupiter is the first internal narrator of sorts in the *Aeneid* and predicts the founding of Rome and its future glory while reassuring Venus that Juno's plans to thwart Aeneas will ultimately fail. Jupiter plays a similar role in the *Metamorphoses* as far as his role as internal narrator is concerned; however, he certainly does not foresee a bright future for any member of the human race throughout this episode.

After telling the council of the gods that the current version of the human race is incorrigible, Jupiter assuages their fears regarding Lycaon by stating that he has already been punished (*Met.* 1.209) but that he will recount his Arcadian adventures to them anyway. In order to verify the reports of dastardly human deeds for himself, he travels in Arcadia while

---

[123] For a tidy summary of all the evidence having to do with Arcadia and human sacrifice, see Hughes 1991:96–107. See also Burkert 1983:84–90 and Detienne and Svenbro 1989:155–157.

[124] Segal 1999:401–402.

[125] Segal 1999:402.

disguised as a human. Jupiter finally arrives at Lycaon's settlement in Arcadia after having encountered all kinds of human treachery and describes it as *Arcadis hinc sedes et inhospita tecta tyranni* (*Met*. 1.218), which foreshadows Lycaon's upcoming violation of *xenia* with *inhospita tecta*.

At this point, Jupiter has had enough of his human disguise. Accordingly, he indicates to the common people that a god has arrived among them. While they begin to revere him, Lycaon views Jupiter's claim to divinity skeptically.

> signa dedi uenisse deum, uulugsque precari
> coeperat; inridet primo pia uota Lycaon,
> mox ait "experiar deus hic discrimine aperto
> an sit mortalis, nec erit dubitabile uerum."
>
> *Metamorphoses* 1.222–223

> I gave a sign that a god had come, and the common folk
> began to worship me. Lycaon at first mocked at their pious
> prayers; and then he said: 'I will soon find out, and that by a plain
> test, whether this fellow be god or mortal. Nor
> shall the truth be at all in doubt.'

Jupiter, as a divine *xenos*, expects a certain amount of respect from human inhabitants of the mortal realm. Lycaon, however, views Jupiter's claim to divinity with skepticism. First, he laughs, which potentially places him in the realm of lower, less elevated poetry *inridet* (*Met*. 1.221). Interestingly enough, Lycaon uses language related to the legal sphere when describing his intentions towards Jupiter. The verb *experiar* apart from meaning "to test" or "to try" can

also refer to evidence in the courtroom.[126] His use of legal discourse continues with *discrimine aperto* (*Met.* 1.222) or "an open test." Lycaon is not content to believe Jupiter's *ainos* and *signa*; rather he wants to test it for himself with empirical evidence. Jupiter and his claim to divinity are both on trial here. Lycaon attempts to find out the truth; however, he commits several social taboos as a result of his flawed methodology.

As Jupiter mockingly tells us, Lycaon resorts to attempted murder and cannibalism in order to determine whether or not Jupiter is in fact a god.

> nocte grauem somno necopina perdere morte
> me parat—haec illi placet experientia ueri!
>
> *Metamorphoses* 1.224–225

> He planned that night while I
> was heavy with sleep to kill me by an unexpected murderous
> attack. Such was the experiment he adopted to test the truth.

First, Lycaon tries to murder Jupiter in his sleep with 'unexpected death', *necopina morte* (*Met.* 1.224). Jupiter adds a parenthetical remark that echoes Lycaon's own words a few lines above with *experientia* (*Met.* 1.225) and essentially mocks Lycaon's attempt to figure out the message behind the *ainos*. Lycaon expends too much effort to interpret the *ainos* and thus his attempts are derided. Next, Lycaon resorts to an even more explicit violation of *xenia*—feeding his guest human flesh:

[126] OLD s.v.

> nec contentus eo est; missi de gente Molossa
> obsidis unius iugulum mucrone resoluit
> atque ita semineces partim feruentibus artus
> mollit aquis, partim subiecto torruit igni.
>
> *Metamorphoses* 1.226–229

> And not content with that, he took a hostage who had been sent by the
> Molossian race, cut his throat, and some parts of him still warm
> with life, he boiled, and others he roasted over the fire.

Lycaon cuts the throat of a hostage from Molossia and boils him in order to serve him as the main course at dinner. As one might expect, Jupiter takes a dim view of Lycaon's shenanigans. This entire situation, however, originates from Lycaon's failure to interpret the signs of Jupiter's divinity correctly and his complete misunderstanding of the *ainos*. According to Jupiter's account, Lycaon reveals himself to be a terrible *xenos* and one who has no conception of the *philotes* that would bind guest-friends and would cause him to understand the meaning behind Jupiter's signs.[127] Since Lycaon breaks the bonds of *xenia*, the paradigm becomes inverted, which causes Jupiter and Lycaon to exchange hostilities rather than gifts and culminates in the destruction of Lycaon's house and subsequently the entire human race.

Here, we must return to Nagy's analysis of praise and blame poetry in *Best of the Achaeans*, specifically, the encoding of the *ainos* within praise poetry for kings and members of

[127] Nagy 1976:196–198.

the elite.[128] In this episode, Jupiter gives signs that everyone should interpret as meaning that a god has arrived on earth and that the inhabitants of Arcadia should worship him and treat him in a manner befitting his exalted status. This way of encoding signs is similar to the *ainoi* that archaic poets such as Pindar and Hesiod placed in their poetry for those of the aristocratic upper classes who would understand. The most salient example of this is in Pindar's *Olympian* 2 at the end when he mentions having a large quantity of arrows in his quiver aimed at 'those who know' (*Oly.* 2.83–85).[129] Jupiter presents the people of Arcadia with an *ainos* of sorts, or encoded symbols that they are supposed to interpret as meaning that he is a god. As Nagy points out while discussing how Nestor helps Antilochus achieve victory in the funeral games, the *signa* (or *sema* in Greek) function as reminders for people to act appropriately and think correctly.[130] More importantly, kings are supposed to interpret *ainoi* correctly because it helps them dispense justice.

However, because we are in the universe of the *Metamorphoses* in which every principle of every literary genre is turned on its head or altered in some way and because this is an example of blame rather than praise poetry, Jupiter does not direct his *signa* to the social elite. Rather, he gives them to the *uulgus* who interpret them correctly and begin acting piously.

---

[128] Nagy 1979:235ff., 1990:149ff.

[129] Another example of an *ainos* would be the tale of the hawk and the nightingale in Hesiod's *Works and Days* 202–211. Archilochus himself even makes use of *ainoi* by including animal fables in *Fr.* 172–181. For more on Archilochus and *ainoi*, see Miller 1994:23, Steiner 2012:15ff.

[130] Nagy 1990:208–212.

Ironically, it is Lycaon—the king who should interpret *ainoi* correctly—who misunderstands the *ainos* and decides to empirically test the truth of Jupiter's claims. An accurate interpretation of the *ainos* would have resulted in Jupiter being afforded proper treatment in accordance with *xenia*, which goes hand in hand with praise poetry. Instead, he treats Jupiter not as an honored *xenos* but rather as an enemy by first attempting to murder him and then serving him human flesh for dinner. This is the first step in flipping the proper *xenia*/praise poetry paradigm to one based on blame poetry and violations of *xenia*. Next, the way in which Lycaon prepares the hostage constitutes a perversion of sacrificial rites.

> nec contentus eo, missi de gente Molossa
> obsidis unius iugulum mucrone resoluit
> atque ita semineces partim ferventibus artus
> mollit aquis, partim subiecto torruit igni.
>
> *Metamorphoses* 1.226–229

> And not content with that, he took a hostage who had been sent by the
> Molossian race, cut his throat, and some parts of him still warm
> with life, he boiled, and others he roasted over the fire.

He slits the hostage's throat with a knife, *obsidis unius iugulum mucrone resoluit* (*Met.* 1.227) and then proceeds to boil the limbs in water and roasts other parts of the body. In sacrificial rituals, first the sacrifice slits the animal's throat, then boils the flesh and roasts the internal

organs.[131] However, in a normal sacrificial ritual, the animal would be made to nod in assent, and grain or some form of carbohydrate would be involved in the ritual.[132] Presumably, Lycaon's hostage was an unwilling participant, and Jupiter does not mention any grain or barley. Lycaon errs on two fronts: first by engaging in human sacrifice and serving the meat to a guest, secondly by conducting a corrupted form of sacrificial ritual.

Lycaon's decision to murder a Molossian hostage has further resonances with iambic poetry, especially *Epode* 6.[133] In *Epode* 6, Horace rails against someone who has apparently violated the rites of *xenia*, *quid inmerentis hospites vexas, canis / ignavos adversum lupos* (*Ep*. 6.1–2). He subsequently says he will hunt him down in a manner that resembles Pindar in *Pythian* 2.83–85. Unlike Pindar, who compares himself to a wolf, Horace compares himself to a Molossian dog. At the end of the poem, Horace mentions the well-known iambic scapegoats Lycambes and Bupalus by name (*Ep*. 6.13–14). According to Virgil in *Georgics* 3.405, Molossia was renowned for its hunting dogs, which were known as well for being exceptional guard dogs.[134] If we connect this to the Lycaon episode, then it would seem that the wolf slaughters the dog in order to feed him to Jupiter. Wolves and dogs were common targets of invective in

[131] For an extremely detailed and illustrated analysis of how animals were killed and dismembered during sacrificial rituals, see Durand 1989:87–117.

[132] For more on sacrifice and dining, see Burkert 1966:100ff. and Detienne 1989:1–21.

[133] For more on *Epode* 6, see Mankin 1995:136ff., Watson 2003:251ff.

[134] See also Mankin 1995: *ad* 3 and Watson 2003: *ad* 3. They both note the possible intertext with *Pythian* 2.

blame poetry, as well as in instances of invective and insult in epic poetry.[135] Ovid only mentions Molossia in two places in all of his poetry: the passage cited above and one of the places he lists while describing Aeneas' journey in *Metamorphoses* 13. Horace only mentions Molossia in two places as well: *Epode* 6 and *Satire* 2.6.114. In both instances, he discusses dogs and invective. Can it be purely coincidental that Lycaon's hostage just happens to hail from a region famous for dogs, which are also typical targets of invective? Horace's use of a form of *verto* with *vertis minas* is similar to Ovid's use of a form of the same verb to describe Lycaon turning into the flocks of sheep. Although *vertis minas* in *Epode* 6 probably means something along the lines of "you exchange threats," the verb does at its root mean "to turn" and could perhaps recall the turning of the wolf-stepping dance that is associated with Lycambes and invective poetry.[136] The connections between Molossia and invective further strengthen the iambic aspects of this episode.

When Jupiter has had enough of Lycaon's repeated violations of the sacred pact of *xenia*, he quite literally huffs, puffs, and proceeds to destroy Lycaon's house.

> quod simul imposuit mensis, ego uindice flamma
> in domino dignos euerti tecta Penates.
>
> *Metamorphoses* 1.230–231

[135] See Nagy 1979:226 for more on comparisions to dogs in insults.

[136] OLD s.v.

> But no sooner had he placed these before me on the table than I, with my
> avenging bolt, brought the house down upon its household gods,
> gods worthy of such a master.

The instant Lycaon attempts to serve him human flesh, Jupiter reacts by destroying Lycaon's house along with his Penates. Immediately after the destruction of his house, Lycaon spontaneously transforms into a wolf and takes on various wolfish attributes while still retaining some essential aspects of his character. Lycaon the human is remarkably similar to Lycaon the wolf.

> territus ipse fugit nactusque silentia ruris
> exululat frustraque loqui conatur; ab ipso
> colligit os rabiem, solitaeque cupidine caedis
> uertitur in pecudes et nunc quoque sanguine gaudet.
>
> *Metamorphoses* 1.232–235

> The king himself flies in terror and,
> gaining the silent fields, howls aloud, attempting in vain to speak.
> His mouth of itself gathers foam, and with his accustomed greed
> for blood he turns against the sheep, delighting still in slaughter.

Even as he tries in vain to speak, he begins to foam at the mouth and even has his speaking organ obstructed, *frustraque loqui conatur* (*Met.* 1.233). We are reminded of how the invective target has no voice because the individual is enclosed in a narrative and cannot speak.[137]

[137] Nagy 1976: *passim*.

Lycaon cannot tell his side of the story anymore because he completely loses the ability to speak or exist in human society.

The emphasis on Lycaon's speech, or lack thereof, is what is of interest here, and has potential intertextual echoes in both Callimachus and Hyginus. Jupiter specifically refers to the *silentia ruris* (*Met.* 1.232) before describing how Lycaon can no longer speak. Instead, he merely howls while trying to speak. This is similar to how iambic poets enclose the targets of their invective in a narrative. It is almost as though Lycaon's attempts to speak result in him becoming more animalistic than he already is. In *Iambos* 2, Callimachus recounts things that Aesop presumably said.[138] Of particular interest here is Callimachus' description of Zeus, especially with respect to the powers of speech of various animals. He states that Zeus removes the ability of animals to speak, τῶν ἑρτετῶν μὲν ἐξέκοψε τὸ φθέγμα (*Iamb.* 2.7). The verb he uses, ἐξέκοψε from ἔκκόπτειν to cut out/off, resembles Jupiter's description of how the human race ought to be eliminated before he begins his tale of Lycaon's misdeeds, *sed immedicabile curae* / *ense recidendum*. In both instances, Jupiter/Zeus remedies the situation by "chopping off" the offending part, whether it is the animals' ability to speak, or the entire human race in general. Moreover, the diegesis for *Iambos* 2 comments that the reason Zeus made animals

[138] For more on speakers and *Iambos* 2 in general, see Kerkhecker 1999:49–63 and Acosta-Hughes 2002:170–190.

unable to speak was because the fox criticized him for not being a just ruler. In any event, Zeus is responsible for robbing sentient beings of speech in an iambic setting.

If we look at Hyginus' account of Lycaon and Callisto, Lycaon's daughter, we see that Jupiter might have an ulterior motive for ensuring that Lycaon never receives the chance to tell his side of the story and for perhaps overly emphasizing that Lycaon can no longer speak in his account.[139] According to Hyginus, Jupiter indeed came to Lycaon as a guest, *in hospitium uenisse* and proceeded to violate *xenia* by raping Callisto, *filiam eius Callisto compressisse* (*Fab.* 176.1). Clearly, raping the daughter of one's host constitutes unacceptable behavior and a violation of *xenia*. Ovid uses a form of the verb *comprimo* as well in the Lycaon episode, but to describe how Jupiter quiets the uproar from the other gods during the *concilium deorum*, *murmura compressit* (*Met.* 1.206). Lycaon's sons were unconvinced of Jupiter's identity and then tried to kill him in order to test whether or not he was indeed a god, at which point Jupiter destroyed Lycaon's house and turned him into a wolf (*Fab.* 176.2–4). Like Lycaon himself in the *Metamorphoses*, his sons try to empirically prove whether or not Jupiter is a god. Unlike Lycaon, however, they do not try to kill him in his sleep; rather, they only attempt to force him to practice cannibalism. In both accounts, Jupiter acts swiftly by destroying Lycaon's house (and sons in Hyginus' version) and then turning Lycaon himself into a wolf. In Hyginus' version of

[139] *Maximas gratias ago* to RJT for pointing this out. See also Anderson 1989:96.

events, Lycaon and his family would seem to have a legitimate reason to violate *xenia*, given that Jupiter already violated it by raping Callisto. Since Ovid and his audience were most likely aware of Hyginus and his version of events, Jupiter seems to repress Lycaon's ability to speak so that he will not discredit Jupiter. Ovid also demonstrates his familiarity with Hyginus' account by having Jupiter specifically refer to the *mensa*, or table, of Lycaon. In Hyginus' version, the place where Jupiter kills Lycaon's sons is called *Trapezos*, which would seem to be a transliteration of the Greek noun τράπεζα, which also means table. Moreover, Jupiter acts just like Zeus of Callimachus' second iambic poem by removing Lycaon's ability to speak.

Jupiter continues his narrative of Lycaon's transformation by discussing how he retains essential aspects of his character:

> in uillos abeunt uestes, in crura lacerti;
> fit lupus et ueteris seruat uestigia formae:
> canities eadem, eadem uiolentia uultus,
> idem oculi lucent, eadem feritatis imago est.
>
> *Metamorphoses* 1.236–239

> His garments change to shaggy hair, his arms to legs. He turns into
> a wolf, and yet retains some traces of his former shape. There is
> the same grey hair, the same fierce face, the same gleaming eyes,
> the same picture of beastly savagery.

Lycaon has now literally transformed into the stereotypical outcast target of iambic invective. Jupiter begins his description of Lycaon's animalistic transformation by detailing first how

Lycaon has changed, but did not really change that much from his original form. The repetition of *eadem* in quick succession as well as *idem* supports this. Jupiter essentially tells us that Lycaon was wolfish all along. He then applies the Lycaon narrative to the entire human race.

> occidit una domus, sed non domus una perire
> digna fuit; qua terra patet, fera regnat Erinys.
> in facinus iurasse putes; dent ocius omnes,
> quas meruere pati, (sic stat sententia) poenas.
>
> *Metamorphoses* 1.240–243

> One house has fallen; but not
> one house alone has deserved to perish. Wherever the plains of
> earth extend, wild fury reigns supreme. You would deem it a
> conspiracy of crime. Let them all pay, and quickly too, the
> penalties which they have deserved. So stands my purpose.

Indeed, Lycaon has undergone a complete transformation from a tyrant or king, arguably among the most civilized echelon of humanity to being a wolf—the stereotypical outcast who inhabits liminal spaces and threatens the social structures on which society depends.

In terms of wolves and their role in Indo-European literature, Detienne and Svenbro make the following observations.[140] Throughout Aesop's fables, wolves display savvy cunning about human society and social organization. In one fable, the wolf argues that all food should be distributed equally, but he himself hides his portion from the collective. Detienne and

[140] Much of this paragraph is a summary of Detienne and Svenbro 1989:148–163.

Svenbro continue by noticing how the wolf refers to himself as a butcher within Aesop and argue that the figure of the wolf must be read as a representation of a greedy tyrant who squanders resources and consumes them.[141] If we think about the wolf in terms of exchange rituals and poetry of praise and blame, the wolf, at least in Aesop, is a figure that stops exchange rituals simply because he consumes everything he hunts and does not divide it or exchange it with anyone else.[142] This leads to isolation and fattening oneself on whatever dead animal one has killed and very much resembles Pindar's description of Archilochus in *Pythian* 2. By violating *xenia* and murdering a hostage, the tyrant literally becomes a wolf.

Moreover, in terms of cooking and eating, Detienne and Svenbro note that in Aesop, Plutarch, and others, wolves play the role of butcher, distributor, and consumer but often fail to share their bounty with the community.[143] Wolves do not participate in exchange rituals and cannot exist in a sustainable society. Just like Lycambes or the target of iambic invective, the wolf becomes an outcast. Indeed, once Lycaon transforms into a wolf, he begins to gorge himself on the sheep in his kingdom, which were presumably there to feed his fellow citizens, *solitae cupidine caedis / uertitur in pecudes et nunc quoque sanguine gaudet* (*Met.* 1.234–235). As

[141] Detienne and Svenbro 1989:154–155.

[142] Detienne and Svenbro 1989:151.

[143] Detienne and Svenbro 1989:157–158.

mentioned previously, the turning *uertitur* could reflect the twisting wolf step, and the reckless slaughtering of sheep echoes how the wolf consumes more than his share.

Alternatively, one could read this as an initiation ritual gone horribly wrong.[144] Unlike the werewolves in Pausanias that return to human form upon completion of the ritual, Lycaon can never transform back into a human. Jupiter has undergone a transformation of sorts as well—from the blamed to the blamer, which has important ramifications for the human race. Jupiter's account of the Lycaon episode as reported to the deities of Olympus is therefore an *ainos* of the sort one would find in blame poetry, albeit with humans and animals rather than only the animals usually found in iambic *ainoi*. Lycaon begins the blaming process by violating *xenia*, which then prompts Jupiter to take on the role of the iambic poet and take measures to restore order to society.

## Conclusion: Praise, Blame, and the Dangers of Discourse in Real Life

Although this episode would seem to be a simple case of Jupiter delivering invective against a wrongdoer and attempting to restore social order in some fashion, the reality is much more complicated when we take into account the paradigm based on exchange rituals that creates a framework for praise poetry and blame poetry. Jupiter comes down from Olympus to Arcadia and expects that Lycaon will fulfill the basic principles of *xenia*, chief among which is the

[144] See Burkert 1983:90 for initiation rituals and wolves in Arcadia.

notion of treating one's guests well. Needless to say, plotting to murder one's guests and attempting to feed them is the complete opposite of how normal, upstanding human beings observe *xenia*. Blame poets certainly do have a place in society, even according to Pindar, provided that they blame those who deserve it. As Pindar comments in *Pythian* 2:

> φίλον εἴη φιλεῖν·
> ποτὶ δ' ἐχθρὸν ἅτ' ἐχθρὸς ἐὼν λύκοιο
> δίκαν ὑποθεύσομαι,
> ἄλλ' ἄλλοτε πατέων ὁδοῖς σκολιαῖς
>
> *Pythian* 2.82ff

> Let me befriend a
> friend
> but against an enemy, I shall, as his enemy,
> run him down as a wolf does,
> stalking now here, now there on twisting paths.

Pindar states that when he must confront enemies, he will engage in the discourse of blaming in the manner of a wolf stalking his opponents in order to mete out the appropriate response. However, both Pindar and Bacchylides compare those who engage in blame indiscriminately and excessively to gluttons who gorge themselves on inappropriate food, e.g. Archilochus in *Pythian* 2.[145] In other words, blaming becomes a means by which a community is strengthened through correcting wrongdoing when the target of invective deserves it. However, when one

[145] Nagy 1979: 224–226. Apart from *Pythian* 2, see also Bacchylides 3.68.

blames someone who has done nothing wrong, blame poetry isolates and breaks bonds between members of the community.[146]

Since both Lycaon and Jupiter blame each other in some way throughout this episode—who is the appropriate blamer? Is there an appropriate blamer? Or are both individuals in the wrong? From Jupiter's account *prima facie*, it seems that he acts appropriately after Lycaon both attempts to kill him and serve him a dinner consisting of human flesh. Although using the crime of one person as justification for eliminating all of humanity does seem extreme, this is how the gods of the *Metamorphoses* tend to behave. However, when we take into account both Hyginus' version of events, in which Jupiter violates *xenia* first by raping Callisto, and the fact that we never hear from Lycaon, except that which Jupiter quotes as direct speech, things do not seem as straightforward. Who is the ultimate arbitrator in terms of deciding who can appropriately blame whom? Is there an ultimate arbitrator? If we return to Detienne and Svenbro's arguments about the unsustainability of wolfish ways, then perhaps Jupiter does everyone a favor by eliminating Lycaon and the entire world, assuming they all behave like Lycaon. There appears to be a distinction between someone who engages in justified blame poetry, e.g. Horace in *Epode* 6 or Pindar and his wolf-walking in *Pythian* 2, and someone who uses it to excess and is not justified in doing so, cf. Pindar's description of Archilochus in

[146] See Kurke 1991:100–101.

*Pythian* 2. In *Metamorphoses* 1, Jupiter fits the description of the former, whereas Lycaon's actions correspond to the latter. Then again, we must keep in mind that our interpretation of who is justified in blaming whom rests on whether one doubts the veracity of Jupiter's narrative. Ovid seems to have left the question ambiguously open-ended and perhaps intentionally so.

Of course, discussing the excessive wrath of Jupiter and suppression of narrative cannot happen without thinking about Ovid's own exile in some way. Indeed, Ovid specifically tells us in his sphragis at the end of *Metamorphoses* that the *Iovis ira* (*Met.* 15.871), along with a host of other things, will not be able to destroy his work, i.e. his voice, as it were.[147] In the end, as a result of the inversion of the *xenia* paradigm and Jupiter taking on the role of an iambic poet, Jupiter destroys the entire human race. Poetry and discourse have consequences and can be deadly if used in the wrong way.

[147] See my conclusion with analysis of the end of *Metamorphoses* 15 for more on the connections between Augustus and Jupiter.

# Chapter 3
# These Aren't the Arms You're Looking For: Odysseus/Ulysses, Praise Poetry, and Jedi Mind Tricks

## Introduction

Throughout both *Nemean* 7 and *Nemean* 8, Pindar makes a concerted effort to paint Odysseus in a negative light.[148] In *Nemean* 7, he states that Homer greatly embellishes Odysseus' ordeals and that if the Achaeans were not misled, they would have awarded Achilles' arms to Ajax since he was a superior warrior (*Nem.* 7.21–30). In *Nemean* 8, Pindar describes in more detail the causes of Ajax's suicide as a result of his failure to receive the arms and attributes them to envy and Odysseus' rhetorical skill (*Nem.* 8.20–33). In both situations, Odysseus' use of flattery and verbal manipulation deprives Ajax, the superior warrior, of his right to Achilles' arms. As a result of this injustice, Ajax commits suicide. As Stanford remarks, "Homer's favourite hero has become Pindar's most hated villain."[149]

A similar situation occurs in the *Metamorphoses*. Ovid portrays the contest between Ajax and Ulysses in *Metamorphoses* 13 as one between a skilled, but crooked rhetorician and a speaker who is not as verbally savvy as his opponent. As Neil Hopkinson and others have noted, the argument of Ovid's Ulysses rests upon misinterpretations of Homer and dubious

[148] Stanford 1954:93 comments, "Dido at her death prayed for an avenger to scourge her Trojan deceiver. Pindar is Ajax's avenging Hasdrubal, Euripides his Hannibal, and between them they came close to ruining Odysseus' reputation for ever."

[149] Stanford 1954:94.

highlighting of his own limited prowess in battle.[150] Ovid's Ulysses resembles the archetypal sophist who makes weaker arguments appear stronger than they actually are. There are a multitude of interpretations concerning Ulysses' speech in the context of the *Metamorphoses* as a whole. Duc argues that Ulysses' speech contains references to neoteric poetic principles and that we should interpret it Arachne's tapestry in *Metamorphoses* 6.[151] Pavlock takes his interpretation a step further and thinks that Ulysses is a representation of Ovid himself as a poetic figure. Most agree that Ulysses' speech is rhetorically masterful, albeit somewhat over-the-top. Gross argues that his speech is entirely too long-winded and that Ovid's intent is to parody Ulysses and rhetoric in general.[152] Regardless of how one views Ulysses' speech, the end result is the same—Ulysses wins Achilles' arms, and Ajax loses the contest, which results in his subsequent suicide. Moreover, Ulysses' manner of speaking does not conform to standard principles of Roman rhetoric, whereas one could easily lift a version of Ajax's speech straight from a handbook of rhetoric.[153] The success of Ulysses' speech is an anomaly, especially considered in the context of Ovid's other depictions of lengthy speeches.[154] As Richard Tarrant has argued, the vast majority of lengthy, well-crafted speeches in the Ovidian corpus utterly

---

[150] Stanford 1954:139ff., Hopkinson 2000:9–22, Pavlock 2009a:110–161.

[151] Duc 1994.

[152] Gross 2000:55–57.

[153] Bömer 1969, Duc 1994, Hopkinson 2000, Pavlock 2009a.

[154] Cf. Apollo's speech to Daphne in *Metamorphoses* 1, the elegiac lover in *Am.* 1.1, etc. See Tarrant 1995:65ff. for more exempla of unsuccessful rhetoric in Ovid.

fail at their intended purpose.[155] Ulysses' speech is one of the few that succeeds. What, pray tell, is the *je ne sais quoi* that makes Ulysses and his speech, filled with fabrications and exaggerations, succeed?

Needless to say, positing a direct intertextual relationship between Ovid and Pindar for this episode would be challenging (and contentious) at best and misguided at worst. There are a number of accounts of both this particular contest and of the consequences of Ulysses' trickery that chronologically fall between Pindar's explicit condemnation of the outcome of the contest and Ovid's depiction of it.[156] Aeschylus' mostly lost tragedy, the *Ὅπλων Κρίσις*, was most likely a major source for Ovid; however, not enough of the tragedy survives intact to determine this for certain. Moreover, Aeschylus himself probably had Pindar in mind to some extent while writing it.[157] Antisthenes has the most complete account of the dueling speeches between the two heroes, and indeed, there are several instances of intertextuality between the two accounts.[158] Apart from Antisthenes, one could also certainly point to Odysseus in Sophocles' *Ajax* and *Philoctetes* for more inspiration for an unflattering portrayal of him. That said, the Odysseus of Sophocles' *Ajax* does not come across as the Machiavellian mastermind we see in *Metamorphoses* 13; rather, Athena is the one who instigates Ajax's madness and causes

[155] Tarrant 1995.

[156] See Bömer 1969:195–200, Hyuck 1991:10–53, and Hopkinson 2000:9–16 for a summary of Ovid's potential sources for his portrayal of the *armorum iudicium*.

[157] For more on the relationship between Aeschylus and Pindar, see Finley 1955.

[158] See the next section for more details.

his downfall.[159] Another instance in Sophocles in which Odysseus is a villain is in the *Philoctetes*. Odysseus is indeed a deceitful schemer; however, we do not see very much of him since Sophocles focuses mainly on the interaction between Neoptolemus and Philoctetes. Though Odysseus uses his rhetoric to persuade Neoptolemus to initially trick Philoctetes, Philoctetes eventually comes to Troy of his own free will after Heracles' speech towards the end of the tragedy, so one could debate whether Odysseus' scheme itself was successful.

The *armorum iudicium* was a favorite topic of the Latin tragedians, including Livius Andronicus, Ennius, Accius, and Pacuvius, and Ovid certainly would have been familiar with these accounts of the verbal sparring between Ajax and Ulysses. Unfortunately, none of these tragedies survive in their entirety, and only paltry fragments remain. Indeed, without the entire text of the lost tragedies in Latin and Aeschylus' lost trilogy, it is impossible to know for certain whether what I tentatively trace back to Pindar was in fact in Pacuvius, Accius, or perhaps Aeschylus. Such are the trials and tribulations of working with ancient texts.

That said, however, Ovid does diverge from the fragments of our Greek and Latin tragedians, and the rhetoricians in a few ways that suggest a possible connection between Pindar's depiction of Odysseus and Ovid's account of the *armorum iudicium*. First, like Pindar and Sophocles, Ovid takes care to point out that it is the generals, or the *proceres*, of the

[159] Stanford 1954:104 describes Odysseus in the *Ajax* as "a second-rate sleuth in a detective story."

Achaean army who act as judges of this battle of words. Indeed as Pavlock and Hopkinson, among others, have argued, one of the reasons Ajax seems to fail is because he addresses his speech to the rank and file soldiers rather than appealing to the leaders of the army.[160] Ulysses, on the other hand, only addresses the leaders of the Achaean army and wins. This is markedly similar to the way in which Pindar addresses his poetry to the members of the elite social echelon rather than the chattering crows that comprise the masses (cf. *Olympian* 2.85–87). In Ovid, however, the declaimers describe their genealogies at the beginning of both speeches, and Ulysses even criticizes its usefulness. Structurally, the genealogical descriptions in both speeches appear as they do in Pindar: at the beginning of the ode and as a transition into more mythological exempla.

Of particular interest is the contrast in structure between Ajax's and Ulysses' speeches. The unusual way in which Ulysses structures his speech is the primary factor that could indicate some Pindaric connection or, more likely, a connection to praise poetry in general. As Pavlock among others have noted, Ajax's speech follows a Roman declamation, whereas Ulysses "blurs the boundaries between rhetoric and poetry, combining the 'muscle' of rhetoric with the 'brilliance' of poetry."[161] Indeed, Ulysses' speech at first glance appears associative and perhaps even stream of consciousness. However, if we analyze some of the rhetorical

[160] Hopkinson 2000: *ad* 120–122.

[161] Pavlock 2009:112.

devices he uses and the way he organizes his argument, some marked similarities with Pindar and other forms of praise poetry emerge. Ulysses uses rhetorical devices including priamels, caps, and crescendos, all of which are prominently featured, not only in epinician poetry but also in exempla of later praise poetry of the sort we see in Callimachus, Theocritus, and Horace. That said, we must keep in mind that the *armorum iudicium* is a rhetorical contest modeled on *controversiae* performed in Roman schools of rhetoric as well as Ovid's own career as an orator and penchant to include displays of rhetoric in his works.[162] The *Metamorphoses* is a poem, and both speakers speak in dactylic hexameter. Therefore, it does not seem terribly farfetched to suggest that Ovid could make use of a possible poetic paradigm, particularly one found in Pindar and praise poetry since both participants in the contest must praise themselves in order to prevail.

Reading *Metamorphoses* 13 with an eye to epinician topoi and praise poetry in general does illuminate the more poetic features and structure of Ulysses' speech. Lest we forget, the *armorum iudicium* is at its essence a contest with a winner and a loser, and one can apply the epinician paradigm to this type of competition, albeit with a few alterations. Rather than a contest in which two athletes compete for a crown of some sort and praise, this contest is a measure of who can praise oneself most convincingly. Praise itself becomes the medium for a

[162] I will discuss Porcius Latro and his *amorum iudicium* in more detail in the next section.

competition, with arms, normally equipment or perhaps spoils, as the prize. It is certainly possible, and indeed quite likely, that the parts of Ulysses' speech which seem to recall praise poetry are more related to exempla of praise poetry and panegyric found in Horace and Callimachus, which themselves can be traced back to Pindar, rather than a direct link between Ovid and Pindar. That said, however, reading Ulysses' speech with praise poetry and the epinician paradigm in mind sheds light on the rationale behind its structure and content.

## Background: Other Accounts of the *Armorum Iudicium*

The earliest reference to a verbal battle between Odysseus and Ajax occurs while Odysseus recounts his *katabasis* to the Phaecians in *Odyssey* 11. During Odysseus' trip to the underworld, Ajax refuses to speak with him because he is still angry about losing the contest for Achilles' arms (*Od*. 11.541–551). Odysseus says here that the combination of the captive Trojans and Athena (παῖδες Τρώων δίκασαν καὶ Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη, *Od.* 11.549) presided over the contest to determine the recipient of Achilles' arms. Aristarchus did dismiss this line as spurious, as the scholiast tells us; however, recent scholarly opinion perhaps begs to differ.[163] Although Odysseus tries to cajole Ajax into talking to him, Ajax will hear none of it and never speaks to him.

[163] The scholiast is H. See also Huyck 1991:14–15.

The other early accounts we have of the judgment of arms occur in the *Aethiopis* and *Little Iliad*. In the *Little Iliad*, the poet describes the contest briefly and states that Odysseus wins, but does so through Athena's plans, κατὰ βούλησιν Ἀθηνᾶς, which seems to detract from Odysseus' rhetorical prowess. The *Little Iliad* and Odysseus' account of the contest in the *Odyssey* support the notion that Odysseus himself won fairly—any trickery would have been the fault of Athena. According to an entry in the scholia to Aristophanes' *Knights* (1056), the Greeks sent scouts to the wall of Troy in order to ascertain whom the Trojans thought was the superior warrior and overheard Trojan women marveling at Odysseus. In the *Aethiopis*, the Trojan captives are also the judges of the contest. Unfortunately, apart from the *Odyssey*, only fragments of the other epic accounts remain.

Aeschylus' lost *Ὅπλων Κρίσις* formed part of a trilogy featuring Ajax, his suicide, and its aftermath. As with the *Aethiopis* and *Little Iliad*, only a few fragments are extant; however, they do provide some insight into Aeschylus' version of the contest. Ajax is the most likely speaker of the two fragments that are most relevant for our purposes, and both of them indicate that Aeschylus depicted the dueling speeches themselves, rather than just the aftermath, which we see in Sophocles' *Ajax*. One of them is an insult directed at Odysseus' ancestry and possible relation to Sisyphus, ἀλλ' Ἀντικλείας ἆσσον ἦλθε Σίσυφος,τῆς σῆς λέγω τοι μητρός, ἥ σ' ἐγείνατο, which Ovid's Ajax echoes in *Met*. 13.31–33. The other concerns the difference between

truth and falsehood, ἁπλᾶ γάρ ἐστι τῆς ἀληθείας ἔπη. Both of these were most likely spoken by Ajax and correspond with how he appears in later versions of this conflict: as someone who is not terribly cunning when it comes to rhetoric.[164]

Sophocles' *Ajax* would be one of the most likely candidates for an intervening intertext between Ovid and Pindar. It is also rather convenient since the tragedy is fully extant. As in Ovid and in Pindar, the Greek generals decide who wins the contest and decide in favor of Odysseus, which sends Ajax into a maniacal sheep-slaughtering frenzy with Athena's help. However, unlike Ovid, Pindar, etc., Sophocles does not portray Odysseus as a devious mastermind who has taken Ajax's arms through trickery and deceit; rather Athena is the one who prompts Ajax to suicide—an important difference from the Odysseus whom Pindar mentions and the Ulysses of *Metamorphoses* 13.

Antisthenes, a Hellenistic rhetorician who only survives in fragments, wrote speeches for Odysseus and Ajax, which do seem to have been a possible source for Ovid.[165] Antisthenes, according to Porphyry's note on *Odyssey* 1.1, defended Odysseus and felt that others unfairly criticized him for being skilled at speaking.[166] In his account of the dueling speeches between Ajax and Odysseus, Montiglio notes, "It cannot be doubted that Antisthenes sides with Odysseus"

---

[164] Huyck 1991:20–21.

[165] For a detailed analysis of Antisthenes' account of the contest, see Hyuck 1991:38–41. See also Stanford 1954:96–100.

[166] Montiglio 2011:23–25. See also Lévystone 2005:183–184.

and further comments that Antisthenes responds to Pindar's criticism of his trials and tribulations being exaggerated by Homer in *Nemean* 7.[167] Unlike Ovid's account, however, Antisthenes' Odysseus does not address the judges of the contest but rather spends most of his energy directly attacking Ajax and even the other members of the Achaean army.[168] Like Ovid's account, however, Antisthenes' Odysseus emphasizes his battles fought at night and makes them into a badge of honor. Unlike mere mortals who use the nights for sleeping, Odysseus fights battles around the clock. He also draws attention to Ajax's stupidity multiple times throughout the speech. Antisthenes' Odysseus, however, is more outwardly aggressive than Ovid's Ulysses in presenting himself and attacking Ajax.

Livius Andronicus, Ennius, Accius, and Pacuvius all wrote tragedies that presumably featured Ajax and his suicide. However, only four lines from Ennius survive. Livius Andronicus wrote the *Ajax Mastiphorus*, but barely two lines survive which are quoted in Nonius. A few more fragments from Accius and Pacuvius survive, but not many. According to Hopkinson, Ovid does appear to allude to both Accius and Pacuvius in several places; however, some of these are dubious since there are so many attested accounts of this particular episode. Hopkinson notes that Ovid's description of Ajax as *toruus* echoes Pacvuius' Ulysses when he describes Ajax, *toruus*

[167] Montiglio 2011:23–24.

[168] Montiglio 2011:25–26.

*praegrandi gradu* (43–44 West), which would seem to support Pavlock's argument that Ovid identifies himself with Ulysses.[169]

As mentioned in the previous section, the *armorum iudicium* was a common topic in Roman *controversiae*, and Ovid even adapts a line from Porcius Latro's version of the debate in *Metamorphoses* 13. Seneca in *Controversia* 2.2.8 tells us that Ovid liked Latro's style, which was filled with *sententiae*. According to Seneca, in Latro's account of these dueling speeches, he has Ajax say, *mittamus arma in hostis et petamus*, which Ovid has Ajax echo in *Metamorphoses* 13.121–122, *arma uiri fortis medios mittantur in hostes; / inde iubete peti.*[170] Unfortunately, this is the only extant line from Latro's account of the episode.

### Pindar, Ajax, Odysseus, *Nemean* 7, and *Nemean* 8

Before turning to Ovid's depiction of the contest in *Metamorphoses* 13, it is first necessary to have a look at *Nemean* 7 and *Nemean* 8 as well as other places in the Pindaric corpus in which Ajax is mentioned in order to understand Pindar's reasons for his negative portrayal of Odysseus and how all of this might relate to Ovid's Ulysses and Ajax in *Metamorphoses* 13. Stanford notes that there appears to be no surviving account of Odysseus winning Achilles' arms by underhanded means either in Homer or in the fragments of the Epic Cycle and

[169] Hopkinson 2000: *ad* 3–4. Pavlock 2009a.

[170] See also Kennedy 1972:405–419 for more on Ovid's relationship to rhetoric.

suggests that Pindar's Theban ancestry made him negatively predisposed towards Odysseus.[171] Bury in his commentary on *Nemean* 7 also cites Pindar's ancestry as a motive for depicting Odysseus in such a way.[172] Pindar did, however, compose both of these odes for Aeginetan victors. Ajax, as a descendant of Aeacus, was an especially significant hero for the Aeginetans, so Pindar would have wanted to mention him.[173] That said, most scholarly attention devoted to *Nemean* 7 focuses on the lack of unity in the ode as well as Pindar's apology to Neoptolemus for his alleged slander of him in *Paean* 6.[174] Indeed, praise and the role of the epinician poet in fending off blame from the *laudandus* go hand in hand. Glenn Most analyzes the legal, contractual language throughout the poem and argues that a major concern of the poem is that "a durable individual identity can only be attained by means of fame, i.e. not by one's own corporeal permanence but instead by a prolonged presence in the discourse of other people."[175] Throughout *Nemean* 7, Pindar provides exempla of the uses and abuses of discourse in this fashion. The most relevant exempla for our purposes, of course, are his descriptions of Odysseus and Ajax.

ἐγὼ δὲ πλέον' ἔλπομαι
λόγον Ὀδυσσέος ἢ πάθαν

[171] Stanford 1954:93–94.

[172] Bury 1965:115.

[173] For more on the importance of Aeacus for Aegina, see Nagy 2011.

[174] For more on *Nemean* 7, see Segal 1967, Katz 1969, Young 1970, Kromer 1975, Most 1985, Steiner 2001.

[175] Most 1985:147.

διὰ τὸν ἀδυεπῆ γενέσθ' Ὅμηρον·
ἐπεὶ ψεύδεσί οἱ ποτανᾷ <τε> μαχανᾷ
σεμνὸν ἔπεστί τι· σοφία
δὲ κλέπτει παράγοισα μύθοις.

*Nemean* 7.20–23

I believe that Odysseus' story
has become greater than his actual suffering
because of Homer's sweet verse,
for upon his fictions and soaring craft
rests great majesty and his skill
deceives with misleading tales.

Pindar states that Odysseus' sufferings and ordeals have been embellished far beyond reality as a result of Homer and that Odysseus' *kleos* from what he has allegedly endured is not entirely legitimate. Pindar's dismissal of the Homeric *muthoi* that enhance Odysseus' elaborated sufferings comes as no surprise, especially if we recall his rejection and correction of the various *muthoi* of Pelops' abduction at the hands of Poseidon in *Olympian* 1.[176] Though Pindar blames Homer rather than Odysseus himself, Odysseus is still implicated in Homer's fabrications. Indeed, because of Homer's *muthoi* that greatly exaggerate the extent of his sufferings, Odysseus' fame lives on unjustly. Immediately after Pindar questions the legitimacy of Odysseus' *kleos*, he laments Ajax's suicide.

εἰ γὰρ ἦν
ἓ τὰν ἀλάθειαν ἰδέμεν, οὔ κεν ὅπλων χολωθείς

[176] For more on Pindar and *muthoi*, see Nagy 1990:66.

ὁ καρτερὸς Αἴας ἔπαξε διὰ φρενῶν
λευρὸν ξίφος· ὃν κράτιστον Ἀχιλέος ἄτερ μάχᾳ
ξανθῷ Μενέλᾳ δάμαρτα κομίσαι θοαῖς
ἂν ναυσὶ πόρευσαν εὐθυπ᾽νόου Ζεφύροιο πομπαί
πρὸς Ἴλου πόλιν. ἀλλὰ κοινὸν γὰρ ἔρχεται
κῦμ᾽ Ἀίδα, πέσε δ᾽ ἀδόκη-
τον ἐν καὶ δοκέοντα·

*Nemean* 7.24–30

... for if they could have seen
the truth, mighty Ajax, in anger over the arms,
would have not planted in his chest
the smooth sword. Except for Achilles, in battle he was
the best
whom the favoring breezes of the straight-blowing
Zephyr conducted to the city of Ilus
in swift ships, to return his wife
to fair-haired Menelaus. But to all alike comes
the wave of Hades, and it falls upon the obscure
and the famous ...

Most agree that the juxtaposition of Odysseus and deceit with Ajax as an honorable warrior deserving of large amounts of *kleos* is implicitly meant to refer to Odysseus winning the arms of Achilles and Ajax's subsequent suicide after losing the debate.[177] A number of scholars have discussed Pindar's comments in *Nemean* 7 about his possible slander of Neoptolemus when he discusses his death in *Paean* 6. This is perhaps Pindar's way of affirming that it is the poet who ultimately determines how subsequent generations view the *laudandus* or protagonist of any

[177] Segal 1967, Young 1970, Kirkwood 1984, Most 1985, Segal 1967, Steiner 2001.

given narrative.[178] However, Elroy Bundy in his *Studica Pindarica* argues that reading any of Pindar's epinician poems as having anything to do with the poet himself and having any other purpose than enhancing the praise of the victor is wrong.[179] Perhaps we should not make the connection with what remains of *Paean* 6. Regardless of what one thinks about the connection between *Paean* 6 and *Nemean* 7, Ajax, Odysseus, and the dangers of deceitful discourse are all prominently featured in *Nemean* 7.

In *Nemean* 8, Pindar's indictment of Odysseus becomes more explicit.[180] He accuses Odysseus of lying and deceiving the Achaeans by using his rhetorical talents to win Achilles' arms.

> ὄψον δὲ λόγοι φθονεροῖσιν,
> ἅπτεται δ' ἐσλῶν ἀεί, χειρόνεσσι δ' οὐκ ἐρίζει.
> κεῖνος καὶ Τελαμῶνος δάψεν υἱόν,
> φασγάνῳ ἀμφικυλίσαις.
> ἦ τιν' ἄγ'λωσσον μέν, ἦτορ δ' ἄλκιμον, λάθα κατέχει
> ἐν λυγρῷ νείκει· μέγιστον δ' αἰόλῳ ψεύ-
> δει γέρας ἀντέταται.
> κρυφίαισι γὰρ ἐν ψάφοις Ὀδυσσῆ Δαναοὶ θεράπευσαν·
> χρυσέων δ' Αἴας στερηθεὶς ὅπλων φόνῳ πάλαισεν.
>
> *Nemean* 8.23–28
>
> And envy fastens
> always on the good, but has no quarrel with lesser men.

[178] Segal 1967, Most 1985, Steiner 2001.

[179] Bundy 1962.

[180] For more analysis of *Nemean* 8, see Bowra 1964:298–299, Carnes 1995 and Burnett 2005.

It was that which feasted on the son of Telamon
when it rolled him over onto his sword.
Truly, oblivion overwhelms many a man whose tongue
is speechless, but heart is bold,
in a grievous quarrel; and the greatest prize
has been offered up to shifty falsehood.
For with secret votes
the Danaans favored Odysseus, while Ajax,
stripped of the golden armor, wrestled with a gory death.

Pindar places this example in the midst of his gnomic discussion about the dangers of rumors spread by envious people, the φθονεροί. Interestingly enough, Pindar claims that the integrity of the voting process whereby the Achaeans determined to whom they should award Achilles' arms was somehow compromised because of secret votes. More interesting here is the contrast between language that relates to twisting things and language that relates to things being upright and straight. Pindar says that envy twisted around Ajax, ἀμφικυλῖσαις (*Nem.* 8.25). The twisting brings to mind Pindar's characterization of blame poetry and envy in *Pythian* 2.[181] Moreover, as mentioned in the previous chapter, blame poets and poetry are often discussed with discourse relating to eating or gnawing, which is evident here with ὄψον (*Nem.* 8.23) and ἅπτεται (*Nem.* 8.27). If words are indeed food for envious people, then Odysseus should be a glutton, just as Pindar describes Archilochus in *Pythian* 2. Pindar presents Ajax as the victim of envy and envious people.

[181] Cf. Lycambes and "wolf-walking" in the previous chapter.

Pindar's discussion of Ajax's suicide is not confined to *Nemean* 7 and *Nemean* 8, however. He also mentions Ajax and the unfortunate circumstances surrounding his death in *Isthmian* 4 as an example of a better person who is overcome by a worse person.

> καὶ κρέσσον' ἀνδρῶν χειρόνων
> ἔσφαλε τέχνα καταμάρψαισ'· ἴστε μάν
> Αἴαντος ἀλκάν, φοίνιον τὰν ὀψίᾳ
> ἐν νυκτὶ ταμὼν περὶ ᾧ φασγάνῳ μομφὰν ἔχει
> παίδεσσιν Ἑλλάνων ὅσοι Τροίανδ' ἔβαν.
>
> *Isthmian* 4.34–37

> And the skill of inferior men can overtake
> and bring down a stronger man. Surely you know of
> Ajax's bloodstained valor, which he pierced late at night
> on his own sword, and thereby casts blame
> upon all the sons of the Hellenes who went to Troy.

The lesser person to whom Pindar refers is clearly Odysseus. Moreover, the awarding of the arms to Odysseus rather than Ajax not only results in Ajax's suicide, but also casts blame upon all of the Achaeans, making them, in effect, responsible for Ajax's fate. Pindar does, however, give credit to Homer for glorifying Ajax's prowess in battle throughout the *Iliad*.

Several themes emerge whenever Pindar mentions Ajax's death. First is Pindar's subtle, or not so subtle as in *Nemean* 8, assertion that Odysseus is a lesser warrior and was unfairly awarded the arms of Achilles. The second is the ability of poetry (and perhaps discourse in general) to glorify or disparage accomplishments. In *Nemean* 7, Pindar says that Homer

exaggerates Odysseus' sufferings and thus the glory he gains from them. Even if Homer embellishes Odysseus' ordeals beyond what Pindar deems acceptable, Odysseus still gains kleos from them. Moreover, Pindar also goes out of his way in *Nemean* 7 to correct his own potentially slanderous portrayal of Neoptolemus in *Paean* 6, which shows Pindar's self-awareness of the helpful and harmful aspects of his craft.[182] All of this becomes even more explicit in *Nemean* 8 when he discusses slander. And, of course, there is Pindar's acknowledgment that Ajax has received glory through Homer in *Isthmian* 4. For Pindar, Ajax and his fate comprise a cautionary story regarding the uses and abuses of poetry and discourse in general.

## Ovid, Ulysses, and Ajax: The Darker Side of Epinician

Having finished a lengthy, but necessary discussion of background information in the preceding section, let us now finally look at Ovid and *Metamorphoses* 13. Although, as mentioned previously, attempting to find connections and intertextual echoes between Ovid and Pindaric epinician poetry as far as this episode is concerned is fraught with potential pitfalls, there are some similarities. Whether they are points of true intertextuality or filtered through an intermediate source which has now been lost is impossible to determine, since it is difficult to read texts that no longer survive. That said, reading Ovid's *armorum iudicium* in

[182] *Pace* Bundy.

*Metamorphoses* 13 while keeping *Nemean* 7, *Nemean* 8, and praise poetry in general in mind does illuminate a possible rationale behind the unconventional aspects of Ulysses' speech. Indeed, Ovid even programmatically indicates that praise will be a part of the upcoming contest at the end of *Metamorphoses* 12.

> non ea Tydides, non audet Oileos Aiax,
> non minor Atrides, non bello maior et aevo
> poscere, non alii; solis Telamone creatis
> Laerteque fuit tantae fiducia laudis.
> a se Tantalides onus inuidiamque remouit
> Argolicosque duces mediis considere castris
> iussit et arbitrium litis traiecit in omnes.
>
> *Metamorphoses* 12.623–628

> Neither Tydides nor Ajax,
> Oileus' son, dares to claim them, nor the lesser Atrides, nor the
> greater in prowess and in age, nor other chieftains. Only the son
> of Telamon and Laërtes' son were bold enough to claim so great a
> prize. To escape the hateful burden of a choice between them,
> Tantalides bade the Grecian captains assemble in the midst of the
> camp, and he referred to all the decision of the strife.

None of the other notable Homeric heroes, including Diomedes, the lesser Ajax, Menelaus, and Agamemnon, think they have any rightful claim to Achilles' arms. Only Telamonian Ajax and Ulysses have *tantae fiducia laudis* (*Met.* 12.625) In light of the possible epinician connection, one cannot overlook this phrase. First, *tantae laudis*, 'such praise,' would seem to allude to the basic principle of the genre of epinician poetry: praise of the victor. Moreover, *fiducia*, while it can

refer to self-confidence, boldness, etc., also has heavy financial and legal connotations and can refer to a deposit, etc.[183] If we view Ovid's use of this noun through an epinician lens, *fiducia* echoes the contractual language we often see in epinician poetry regarding the obligation of the poet to compensate the victor for his effort expended in competition.[184] Like the *laudandus* of an epinician poem whose effort expended in an athletic competition must be compensated by means of an ode in his honor, both Ulysses and Ajax feel that their valiant efforts in the Trojan War must be repaid with Achilles' arms.

My analysis of Ovid's *armorum iudicium* is two-pronged in nature. First, I shall discuss Ulysses' use of topoi and structural features often found in exempla of praise poetry and how all of that differs from Ajax's speech. Secondly, I will analyze how this particular contest, in which praise is the medium for competition rather than the reward, alters the epinician paradigm.

## Structural Considerations and Epinician Topoi

As mentioned previously, the unconventional structure of Ulysses' speech has received much scholarly attention, especially when contrasted with that of Ajax. Ajax's speech is nothing remarkable, though it does follow the structure of a typical Roman *controversia* and is linear in

[183] OLD s.v.

[184] Kurke 1991:85–107. See also *Olympian* 10.1–6, *Olympian* 11.1–6, etc.

nature.[185] He even echoes the style and *sententiae* of Porcius Latro's rendition of this scenario.[186] Rather than addressing his speech to the leaders of the Achaeans, who will determine the winner of the contest, he directs his words at the rank and file infantry who, have no say in the outcome, though they do murmur in assent at the conclusion of his speech, *uulgique secutum / ultima murmur erat* (*Met.* 13.132–124). This is perhaps fitting. Ajax is a man of action and one who prefers to do rather than to speak, as he emphasizes both at the beginning and at the end of his speech.

> tutius est igitur fictis contendere uerbis,
> quam pugnare manu. sed nec mihi dicere promptum,
> nec facere est isti, quantumque ego Marte feroci
> inque acie ualeo, tantum ualet iste loquendo.
>
> denique quid uerbis opus est? spectemur agendo.
> arma uiri fortis medios mittantur in hostes;
> inde iubete peti et referentem ornate relatis.
>
> *Metamorphoses* 13.9–12, 120–122

> 'Tis safer, then, to fight with lying
> words than with hands. But I am not prompt to speak, as he is not
> to act; and I am as much his master in the fierce conflict of the
> battle-line as he is mine in talk.
>
> Finally, what need of words? Let us be seen in action! Let the
> brave hero's arms be sent into the enemy's midst; bid them be
> recovered, and to their rescuer present the rescued arms

[185] Duc 1994:111 provides a diagram of Ajax's and Ulysses' speeches and comments about Ajax's speech that "on pourrait dire que sa structuration sort d'un manuel de rhétorique."

[186] Due 1997:354–355, Pavlock 2009a:111 as well as n4 and n5.

Like a hero in the Homeric model, Ajax would prefer to leave the smooth talking to others and accomplish deeds that would result in eternal glory through poetry. Though it is perhaps an unwise decision to insult the contest in which he himself participates, he does the fighting and lets others do the talking. Of course, the rank and file infantry murmur in agreement, *uulgique secutum / ultima murmur erat* (*Met*. 13.123–124). Ajax's message is simple, straightforward with a linear structure, and something with which anyone could agree and understand. This is precisely why he fails. As Hopkinson comments, "Ajax' speech is good of its kind, but it is precisely the wrong kind."[187]

Ulysses, however, takes a different approach to this contest. Indeed, we see this reflected in some of the structural aspects of his speech and use of epinician topoi. Of course Ulysses does not compose an epinician poem to himself—that would be too obvious an attempt at self-praise. However, he does make use of some of the structural characteristics of epinician poetry and combines those with his rhetorical skills in order to convince the Achaeans that he deserves Achilles' arms rather than Ajax. In sum, Ulysses becomes the lethal combination of an unscrupulous praise poet and rhetorician. Ulysses ignores the common soldiers and addresses his fellow commanders instead. Before he begins speaking, he looks at the judges, *oculos paulum*

[187] Hopkinson 2000:17. For others who agree with this assessment, see Wilkinson 1955:231 and Due 1997:353–354. However, some have argued that Ajax's speech is essentially that of a Rob Gronkowski-esque oaf, namely Stanford 1954:141 and Otis 1966:283.

*tellure moratos / sustulit ad proceres* (*Met.* 13.126). Throughout his speech, he addresses individuals and the collective assortment of generals in order to emphasize that these are the people to whom he is speaking. At the end, with a nice bit of ring composition, he addresses them all directly again, *at uos, o proceres* (*Met.* 13.370). Ovid does not mention how the common soldiers responded to Ulysses because they are irrelevant for the purposes of this contest.

The trope of directing one's discourse towards a select few who are in the know is not limited to epinician poetry. We also see this sentiment in Hellenistic poetry, especially in the prologue of Callimachus' *Aetia*, during which he rails against the grumbling Telchines. Horace is perhaps the most explicit in *Odes* 3.1.1 *odi profanum vulgus et arceo*. It is certainly possible that Ovid is doing more with this trope as an Alexandrian topos rather than a Pindaric one. However, this trope does have its roots in epinician poetry, so Ovid does engage with Pindar here, albeit indirectly. Moreover, Horace and Callimachus address their poems to literary sophisticates, not necessarily those of a higher social class, whereas Ulysses explicitly directs his speech to an elite social class. In any event, Ovid's Ulysses behaves in the manner of a learned poet, whether Hellenistic or epinician, and Ajax does not.

Ulysses begins with a prayer. This type of beginning is very common both in Pindar and in other encomiastic poetry.[188] However, although it appears at first glance that Achilles is the

[188] See Bundy 1962:13ff. Hamilton 1974:35, 37–39.

*laudandus*, he is merely a foil. Achilles and the grief the Achaeans feel for him all become a foil for Ulysses' own talents.

> 'si mea cum uestris ualuissent uota, Pelasgi,
> non foret ambiguus tanti certaminis heres,
> tuque tuis armis, nos te poteremur, Achille.
> quem quoniam non aequa mihi uobisque negarunt
> fata,' (manuque simul ueluti lacrimantia tersit
> lumina) 'quis magno melius succedat Achilli,
> quam per quem magnus Danais successit Achilles?
>
> *Metamorphoses* 13.128–134

> "If my prayers and yours had availed, O Greeks, there would
> be no question as to the victor in this great strife, and you,
> Achilles, would still have your own armour, and we should still
> have you. But since the unjust fates have denied him to me and
> you" (and with his hand he made as if to wipe tears from his eyes),
> "who would better receive the great Achilles' arms than he
> through whom the Greeks received the great Achilles?"

Although these lines are not identical to the way in which Pindar or any praise poet would structure the opening of an epinician poem, there are some correspondences. According to Bundy, Pindar tends to open his odes with a list of generalizations that he eventually dismisses by means of a climactic element[189] Race refers to the priamel consisting of water, fire, and gold in *Olympian* 1 as a classic example of how Pindar lists general, nonspecific things in order to

[189] Bundy 1962:36ff.

build up to a grand climax that culminates with Hieron (*Olympian* 1.1–11).[190] Another sort of opening foil is one in which Pindar uses many adjectives and rhetorical questions, and this is very much like the technique Ulysses uses here. Pindar often asks whom he should celebrate (cf. *Olympian* 2.1–8) and who is greater than his *laudandus* (the answer: no one among mere mortals, of course).[191] Ulysses begins by using the grief that the Achaeans feel for Achilles as a foil for himself and uses Achilles in the same way that Pindar uses mythical exempla—as a foil for his *laudandus.*

The lines in which Ulysses transitions from the foil to the climax of the foil even recall Pindar's rhetorical questions and feigned *aporia* in similar situations, as described above. Although the presumed answer to "Who is better to succeed Achilles than the one who brought Achilles to the Achaeans?" is Ulysses himself, ending both of the lines with forms of "Achilles" with *Achille*, *Achilli*, *Achilles* (*Met.* 13.130, 133, 134) hides the fact that Ulysses promotes himself here rather than Achilles.[192] Ulysses even incudes a crescendo. Race comments that Pindar often becomes increasingly more specific in his opening crescendos, which is what seems to happen here.[193] The noun *heres* (*Met.* 13.129) picks up *succedat* (*Met.*

[190] Race 1991:9–10. See also Bundy 1982:20ff.

[191] Bundy 1962:56–57.

[192] Cf. Horace 4.2.25ff. when Horace himself as the bee is the target of his own praise. See also Thomas 2011: *ad loc.*

[193] Race 1991:9–10.

13.133) when Ulysses mentions himself and his own talents and focuses attention on Ulysses rather than Achilles.

The climax to this foil comes in the next few lines of the introductory portion of Ulysses' speech in the form of a gnomic statement.

> huic modo ne prosit, quod, ut est, hebes esse uidetur,
> neve mihi noceat, quod uobis semper, Achivi,
> profuit ingenium, meaque haec facundia, si qua est,
> quae nunc pro domino, pro uobis saepe locuta est,
> inuidia careat, bona nec sua quisque recuset.
>
> *Metamorphoses* 13.135–139

> Only let it
> not be to this fellow's profit that he seems to be, as indeed he is,
> slow of wit; and let it not be, O Greeks, to my hurt that I have
> always used my wit for your advantage. And let this eloquence of
> mine, if I
> have any, which now speaks for its owner, but often for you as
> well, incur no enmity, and let each man make the most of his own
> powers.

Achilles and the grief the Achaeans currently feel as a result of his death have been elaborate foils for Ulysses himself and his talents. Bundy comments that Pindar uses temporal adverbs, prayers from the poet, or gnomic statements as transitions from foils to the actual subject of his poem and the praise therein.[194] Ulysses in his infinite wisdom uses all three! Here we have multiple temporal adverbs signaling a return to the here and now, *modo* (*Met.* 13.135), *nunc*

[194] Bundy 1962:3–28, especially 27–28.

(*Met.* 13.138) and a jussive subjunctive, *ne prosit … neue mihi noceat* (*Met.* 13.135–136). Ulysses uses two "negative expressions" as Race calls them, which are Pindaric in nature.[195] The negative expression in the line, *huic modo ne prosit, quod, ut est, hebes esse uidetur* (*Met.* 13.135) expressing a wish that Ajax not gain an advantage from his lack of eloquence and that everyone not begrudge Ulysses because of his rhetorical talents resembles similar gnomes in Pindar (cf. *Isth.* 1.41ff.). Ulysses uses this "negative expression" to then transition to a gnomic statement about individual talents, *bona nec sua quisque recuset* (*Met.* 13.139). Warding off envy or slanderous remarks made by envious people from his *laudandus* is one of Pindar's highest priorities in his epinician works.[196] Moreover, envy takes on a very prominent role in *Nemean* 8, since Pindar explicitly states that it kills Ajax, κεῖνος καὶ Τελαμῶνος δάψεν υἱόν, / φασγάνῳ ἀμφικυλίσαις (*Nem.* 8.23–24). Ulysses masterfully makes it seem as though he is quite distraught about Achilles' death while actually embarking on a praise poem with himself and his own talents as the *laudandi.*

The next part of Ulysses' speech concerns his ancestry. Ulysses uses this opportunity to discount claims made to Achilles' arms based on genealogy. This, of course, would seem at first glance at odds with the great importance Pindar places on the ancestry of his victors. Indeed, Pindar often comments that the achievements of his *laudandus* also glorify the

[195] See Race 1990:60–84 for his full discussion of how these work in Pindar.

[196] For a more detailed analysis of Pindar and envy, see Katz 1969 and Bulman 1992.

accomplishments of his forebears.[197] However, if we look at Pindar through the lens of Bundy, we see that Pindar sometimes uses athletes' lineage as a foil to the accomplishments of the athletes themselves.[198] Ulysses takes this approach one step further. He uses a *recusatio* of sorts by disparaging familial ties with the opening statement, *nam genus et proauos et quae non fecimus ipsi, / uix ea nostra uoco* (*Met*. 13.140–141). He then describes his own ancestry after that (*sed enim*) while saying that Ajax has already boasted about his ancestors, so he might as well do the same. In the process, he manages to surpass Ajax in terms of lineage with his statement, *deus est in utroque parente* (*Met*. 13.147). Although Ajax is one of the Aeacidae, he only mentions his divine ancestry on the paternal side of his family.[199] Ulysses, however, has Olympian deities on both sides of his family.

Moreover, Ulysses' transition to his self-aggrandizing argument about why he should have the arms has several things in common with Pindar's typical transitional formulae, as well as similar transitions in Theocritus, Horace, etc. Bundy comments "the laudator can pretend, in order to highlight his next topic, that he has strayed from his theme."[200] Ulysses works in a similar manner here by assuring his audience that there is too much that he has done for them to be able to do it justice in a brief speech (*Met*. 13.160ff.). He then begins the

[197] See also Nagy 1990:210–215 and Kurke 1991:74–82 for more about this.

[198] Bundy 1962:8n20.

[199] For more on Ajax's ancestry and the importance of Aeacus, see Nagy 2011.

[200] Bundy 1962:8n21.

next section of his speech with an example of the performative future, *ducar*, which is also similar to how Pindar structures transitional formulae.[201]

The next part of Ulysses' speech details how he tricked Achilles into joining the Achaean army while disguised as a girl on Skyros.

> praescia uenturi genetrix Nereia leti
> dissimulat cultum natum, et deceperat omnes,
> in quibus Aiacem, sumptae fallacia uestis.
>
> *Metamorphoses* 13.162–164

> Achilles' Nereid mother, foreseeing her son's destruction, had
> disguised him, and the trick of the clothing that he wore deceived
> them all, Ajax among the rest.

The opening lines of this part of his speech portray Thetis as rather deceitful with *dissimulat* (*Met*. 13.163), *deceperat* (*Met*. 13.163), and *fallacia* (*Met*. 13.164). Pindar as well discusses deception and how it is his duty as an epinician poet to do away with variants of myths resulting from deceptive speech quite often.[202] Indeed, Pindar speaks disparagingly of deceptive speech and flattery in *Nemean* 8.

> ἐχθρὰ δ' ἄρα πάρφασις ἦν καὶ πάλαι,
> αἰμθλων μύθων ὁμόφοι-
> τος. δολοφραδής, κακοποιὸν ὄνειδος·
> ἅ τὸ μὲν λαμπρὸν βιᾶται,
> τῶν δ' ἀφάντων κῦδος ἀντείνει σαθρόν.

[201] Bundy 1962:35–36.

[202] For more on how Pindar presents his poetry as authoritative discourse, see Nagy 1990:65ff., 191ff.

*Nemean* 8.32–34

> Yes, hateful deception existed even long ago,
> the companion of flattering tales,
> guileful contriver, evil-working disgrace,
> which represses what is illustrious,
> but holes up for obscure men a glory that is rotten.

Ulysses would seem to act similarly by revealing Achilles' true identity and bringing it out into the light. Ulysses, however, uses Roman legal terminology with *iniecique manum* (*Met.* 13.170) when he describes how he convinced Achilles to fight at Troy. As Hopkinson comments, this is how Romans typically prosecuted people and brought them to court; however, Achilles "seems to have interpreted it as a friendly gesture."[203] Ulysses takes on the role of the praise poet by piercing through falsehood and bringing Achilles' true identity and praiseworthy qualities into the open, yet he himself acts in a deceitful fashion by tricking Achilles. He proceeds in this vein by claiming credit for Achilles' conquests and says that he is the reason for Achilles' accomplishments.

Next, Ulysses claims that his deceptive actions and skills benefit everyone in the Achaean army. His methods of doing this are similar to how Pindar integrates the laudandus of a victory ode back into the community by demonstrating the positive effect that the victory has on the community. Leslie Kurke analyzes this theme in terms of *megaloprepia* and argues

[203] Hopkinson 2000: *ad loc*. See also Hyuck 1991: *ad loc*.

that Pindar neutralizes the possible envy that could come from the victor's fellow citizens as a result of the athletes' extreme expenditures by describing their victories and the expenditures leading up to them in terms of how they enhance the reputation of the city.[204] In this way, the victor's athletic talents and financial resources are not seen as things that would merit envy and the negative effects of that, but as things that bring *kleos* to the city. Pindar in *Olympian* 3.2, *Isthmian* 1.10, and *Pythian* 6.5 describes the glory conferred upon the victor as a common possession of the community.[205] Ulysses refers to his *ingenium*, mentioned earlier in his speech, and describes how he used it to facilitate Agamemnon's sacrifice of Iphigenia: *ego mite parentis / ingenium uerbis ad publica commoda uerti* (*Met.* 13.187–188). He then mentions the *utilitas populi* (*Met.* 13.192) several lines later in order to emphasize that his morally dubious trickery is for the greater good. When he discusses Clytemnestra's deception at his hand, he uses the gerundive with its sense of obligation and of something having to be done in order to focus on that he was simply doing his duty and a service to all of the Achaeans, *mittor et ad matrem, quae non hortanda, sed astu / decipienda fuit* (*Met.* 13.193–194). Just like the *laudandus* in an epinician poem brings glory to the community by means of his accomplishments, so too does Ulysses bring glory to the Achaeans.

[204] Kurke 1991:163–194.

[205] Kurke 1991:204–206.

After Ulysses details how he kept the Achaeans from fleeing their burning ships, he attacks Ajax more directly by asking, *denique de Danais quis te laudatue petitue*? (*Met*. 13.238). Needless to say, the use of *laudat* is of interest here. By asking this rhetorical question to which the answer is some variation of "None of them," Ulysses further minimizes and negates Ajax's accomplishments. If no one praises Ajax, then it means that Ajax has not expended enough effort for him to be compensated. Several lines later, Ulysses alludes to the tradition of Ajax's invulnerability in order to emphasize that Ajax has not been physically strained or harmed in any way during battle. Accordingly, he merits no praise, since he has not "spent" anything.

Ulysses proceeds to characterize Ajax as an illiterate boor who is incapable of understanding the significance of the images depicted on Achilles' shield.[206]

> scilicet idcirco pro nato caerula mater
> ambitiosa suo fuit, ut caelestia dona,
> artis opus tantae, rudis et sine pectore miles
> indueret? neque enim clipei caelamina novit,
> Oceanum et terras cumque alto sidera caelo
> Pleiadasque Hyadasque immunemque aequoris Arcton
> [diuersosque orbes nitidumque Orionis ensem.
> postulat, ut capiat quae non intellegit arma!]
>
> *Metamorphoses* 13.287–295

> Was it for this,
> forsooth, that the hero's mother, goddess of the sea, was ambitious
> for her son, that those heavenly gifts, the work of heavenly art,

[206] See Duc 1994 for a more comprehensive interpretation of this passage.

> should clothe a rough and stupid soldier? For he knows nothing of the relief-work of the shield: the sea, the lands, the deep starry heavens, the Pleiades, the Hyades, the Bear that never bathes in Ocean, and Orion with his glittering sword rotating opposite her. [He asks for armour which he cannot appreciate.]

The way in which Ulysses describes Ajax in this passage is quite similar to Virgil's description of Aeneas in *Aeneid* 8 after he has received his shield from Venus that is decorated with images of Roman military victories. Although his shield is painted with images of events to come in Roman history, Virgil tells us Aeneas has no idea of their significance and describes him as *rerumque ignarus* (*Aen.* 8.730). A Roman audience would raise its collective eyebrows at a comparison of Ajax to Aeneas, especially a comparison that is meant as pejoratively as this one. Hyuck notes that Ulysses has made it seem as though *miles* is a pejorative term.[207] Ovid also channels Pindar, in that Pindar makes it very clear that the *ainos* or hidden message in his poems is directed only to the elite who can understand it (cf. the end of *Olympian* 2, insert Greek later).[208] If Ajax were the victor, then Ajax would be one of the elite who presumably would be able to understand a hidden *ainos.* Since he is not, according to Ulysses, then it stands to reason that he should not be the victor of this particular contest and should not receive Achilles' arms. Moreover, by emphasizing Ajax's alleged inability to interpret the images on Achilles' shield, Ulysses implicitly disparages his skill in battle. The ability to recognize the

[207] Hyuck 1991: *ad loc.*

[208] Nagy 1979:235ff., 1990:149ff.

various emblems on other warriors' shields means that a warrior can determine the identity of his enemies and pinpoint whose arms would confer more symbolic capital if taken as spoils.[209] Not only does Ulysses make it seem as though Ajax is not one of the elite in terms of intellect, he also subtly insults Ajax's experience in battle.

Ulysses' focus on his deeds conducted at night could also be a variation on the epinician paradigm. Fighting at night and conducting other business at night is characteristic of Ulysses in a number of texts.[210] Ulysses in this scenario emphasizes his bravery for doing things in the middle of the night. Pindar often comments how the job of the epinician poet is to bring the deeds of his *laudandus* into the light (cf. *Isth.* 4.45ff.). Pindar says in *Isthmian* 4 that Ajax's suicide was a shameful event that took place at night.

> ἴστε μάν
> ἔσφαλε τέχνα περὶ ᾧ φασγάνῳ μομφὰν ἔχει
> πάιδεσσιν Ἑλλάνων ὅσοι Τροίανδ' ἔβαν.
>
> *Isthmian* 4.35–36

> Surely you know of
> Ajax's bloodstained valor, which he pierced late at night
> on his own sword, and thereby casts blame
> upon all the sons of the Hellenes who went to Troy.

[209] I owe this point to my awesome friend and colleague, Rebecca Katz, whose dissertation is about Roman spoils.

[210] Stanford 1954:50.

By emphasizing how he enhances his renown by conducting business at night, Ulysses seems to add insult to the injury of Ajax's suicide. By narrating his accomplishments in this setting, Ulysses works as an epinician poet for himself since he brings his feats achieved under the cover of darkness out into the light so that he can receive praise and glory from them.

## The Epinician Paradigm

A contest in which the winner is the person who praises himself most convincingly alters the epinician paradigm in a number of ways. By epinician paradigm, I mean the situation in which an athlete wins a prize for athletic achievements at one of the games and receives one of Pindar's poems as compensation for his efforts and reintegrates him back into his community.[211] The noun *laus* and verb *laudo* occur throughout both Ajax's and Ulysses' speeches in contexts that suggest that Ovid could be aware of a shift in this paradigm. As mentioned previously, Ovid programmatically indicates that praise will be a crucial factor in this contest at the end of *Metamorphoses* 12 with the phrase *tantae fiducia laudis* (*Met*. 12.625). Ajax uses it once with respect to saving Ulysses' life *seruaui animam* (*minimum est hic laudis*) *inertem* (*Met*. 13.76). Ajax says that the effort he expends to save Ulysses really was not worth it because there is hardly any praise for doing so, *minimum est hic laudis* (*Met.* 13.76). Because

[211] Cf. my earlier discussion of this in Chapter 1 with respect to the Apollo and Daphne episode. Nagy 1990:140ff., Kurke 1991:1–12.

Ulysses is intrinsically worthless to the Achaean community, according to Ajax, his efforts to save Ulysses result in inadequate compensation.

Ulysses directly mentions praise four times throughout his speech, twice when he describes the night raid with Dolon. Multiple times when he uses *laus* or *laudo*, words relating to compensation or assimilating back into the whole are in the immediate vicinity. Ulysses first uses the noun *laus* while describing how he persuaded Agamemnon to sacrifice Iphigenia:

> hunc tamen utilitas populi fraterque datique
> summa mouet sceptri, laudem ut cum sanguine penset.
>
> *Metamorphoses* 13.191–192

> still the people's good, his brother,
> and the chief place of command assigned to him, all moved upon
> him to balance praise with blood.

Ulysses says that the greater good, Agamemnon's kingly powers, and Menelaus all helped Agamemnon in his decision to repay praise with blood. Of interest here are the heavy financial connotations of *penset* alongside *laudem*, which could perhaps refer to the exchange of praise.[212] Although Ulysses does not specifically mention his own actions here, the use of *laus* with discourse relating to exchange rituals occurs throughout his speech.

He first uses a form of *laudo* in the rhetorical question that works as a transition to this part of his speech, *denique de Danais quis te laudatue petitue?* (*Met*. 13.238). Of course this is a

[212] OLD s.v. 2. Hyuck 1991: *ad loc*. mentions the "cold commercialism of the verb."

rhetorical question, and the implied answer is, "No one." On the surface, this might seem to be a typical insult; however, when viewed in light of Pindar and epinician poetry, Ulysses' question takes on deeper significance. The implication that no one praises Ajax or seeks him out would mean that Ajax has done nothing worthy for the community in order to merit praise. He has not expended effort that would require him to be compensated.

Another instance of this paradigm occurs when Ulysses describes the circumstances in which he stole Rhesus' horses.

> et iam promissa poteram cum laude reuerti;
> haud contentus eo petii tentoria Rhesi
> inque suis ipsum castris comitesque peremi
> atque ita captiuo, uictor uotisque potitus
> ingredior curru laetos imitante triumphos.
>
> *Metamorphoses* 13.247–252

> and I
> could now go back with the praise which I had striven for; but not
> content with this, I turned to Rhesus' tents and in his very camp I
> slew the captain and his comrades too. And so, victorious and with
> my prayers accomplished, I went on my way in my captured
> chariot in manner of a joyful triumph.

Since he has accomplished his mission, Ulysses says he could have returned to the Achaean camp with the promised praise, *promissa … cum laude* (*Met.* 13.252). It is as though he is aware that the praise he will receive from the Achaean army when he returns with his spoils will

reintegrate him back into the community.[213] He even describes himself as a *victor* (*Met*. 13.251), which further strengthens the connection with praise poetry. Of particular interest to a Roman reader would be Ulysses' use of the word *triumphos* (*Met.* 13.252) and his allusion to the Roman triumphal procession, which one could also interpret as another sort of reintegration ritual after one has gone away and been victorious.[214]

Ulysses continues in this vein when he displays his wounds to the assembled throng of Achaeans. He contrasts his battered and wounded body with Ajax's lack of wounds and invulnerability in order to emphasize that Ajax has not expended enough perceivable effort to warrant compensation.[215]

> at nihil impendit per tot Telamonius annos
> sanguinis in socios et habet sine uulnere corpus.
>
> *Metamorphoses* 13.265–266

> But the son of Telamon in
> all these years has lost no blood in his friends' behalf and his body
> can show no wound at all.

[213] For more on returning, *nostos*, and the epinician paradigm, see Kurke 1991:32–61. See also Nagy 1990:135–146 for more on ritual compensation.

[214] Bömer 1969: *ad loc*., Hopkinson 2000: *ad loc*., and Pavlock 2009a:117, and all notice this.

[215] Bömer 1969: *ad loc*., Hopkinson 2000: *ad loc*., Pavlock 2009a:122n38, Pavlock 2009b:179 note that Ajax is invulnerable in Pindar and Aeschylus, and Ovid seems to allude to that tradition here.

Even *impendit* (*Met.* 13.266) with its heavy financial implications recalls the exchange motif inherent in epinician poetry.[216] Moreover, a Roman audience would have been familiar with this gesture, which candidates for public office often used.[217] If we believe Ulysses, Ajax should not be victorious in this contest and receive compensation in the form of Achilles' arms because he has not expended the requisite amount of effort and suffering in order to require compensation. Indeed, several lines later he reminds us that Diomedes has been adequately compensated for his role in the night raid, *pars est sua laudis in illo* (*Met*. 13.351).

Leslie Kurke argues in *The Traffic in Praise* that one can liken epinician rituals to potlatch.[218] In a normal setting, the prizes for winning at the games have no monetary value, but are symbolic of all the effort and value that has been expended to achieve the desired result. In effect, potlatch, in which the upper class of a society takes part in the competitive destruction of goods in order to achieve higher social status, is very similar to what happens in these athletic events. The athlete receives no financial gain, but everyone acknowledges the resources and effort he has expended.[219] The prize consists of having everyone in the community know that the athlete's household is financially secure enough to spend the

---

[216] OLD s.v.

[217] Huyck 1991: *ad loc*., Pavlock 2009a:120, Pavlock 2009b.

[218] Kurke 1991:99–107

[219] Even now, organizations such as the IOC, USOC, USATF, and the IAAF all try to minimize the monetary profit an athlete can gain from victory by strictly enforcing Rule 40 and imposing rather draconian limitations on the sizes of sponsors' logos. This is a hotly contested issue in track and field at the moment.

resources involved to support someone in full time training for a garland, which then becomes symbolic of that expenditure. This is why, as Kurke says, Pindar often likens his poems to garlands and prizes because they have the same symbolic capital.[220] Ulysses uses the potlatch motif in order to convince the Achaeans that Achilles' arms are what he deserves. Since Ajax is invulnerable, he has not expended enough to receive a reward.

Though Ulysses has a point with regard to recompense, everything becomes even more complicated when we consider how praise works as a competitive medium. Rather than the material object such as a garland being secondary to the poem and the glory and immortality gained from it, the material objects are front and center during this contest in *Metamorphoses* 13. Moreover, this is not a contest in which athletic or fighting skill determines the winner; rather, it is the ability of the speakers to praise themselves compellingly and convince an audience that they are the most deserving of Achilles' arms. Unlike athletic competitions, which are objectively judged, since whoever crosses the finish line first or who throws the discus furthest is (usually) very clear, the contestants are judged based on their appeal to the judges and their ability to effectively praise themselves. Praise is not a reward for having done well in competition or battle; rather, it is the ability to praise oneself that will result in a reward. Rather than relying on a poet to grant them immortality through poetry, the

[220] Kurke 1991:105–107.

contestants make their own *kleos* and eliminate the poet as middleman.[221] In effect, the athlete and poet become one. However, praising oneself does not work in the epinician paradigm. As Kurke argues, "Praise is part of an exchange system, for the same house that produces achievements cannot also manufacture their glorification. Praise must come from the outside in order that the surrounding community not be alienated, or put positively, the value of achievement is the prestige it has in the eyes of that community so that praise must come from the larger group."[222] Without praise from the outside, a house or individual does not participate in economic exchange and would eventually fall apart or implode. Praise eventually does "come from the larger group," in *Metamorphoses* 13 for Ulysses, at least, when the Achaeans decide to award him the arms.

Ajax's final words allude to an instance of gift exchange, which contrasts with how the exchange rituals underlying this particular contest have been distorted.

> arripit ensem
> et 'meus hic certe est; an et hunc sibi poscit Vlixes?
> hoc' ait 'utendum est in me mihi, quique cruore
> saepe Phrygum maduit, domini nunc caede madebit,
> ne quisquam Aiacem possit superare nisi Aiax.'
> dixit et in pectus tum demum uulnera passum,
> qua patuit ferro, letalem condidit ensem.
>
> *Metamorphoses* 13.386–392

[221] Cf. Horace *Odes* 4.8 and 4.9, Pindar *passim*.

[222] Kurke 1991:86.

> Then,
> snatching out his sword, he cried: "But this at least is mine; or
> does Ulysses claim this also for himself? This I must employ
> against myself; and the sword which has often reeked with
> Phrygian blood will now reek with its master's, lest any man save
> Ajax ever conquer Ajax." He spoke and deep in his breast, which
> had not until then suffered any wound, up to the full extent of the
> blade, he plunged his fatal sword.

It is as though since Ajax cannot be reintegrated, he essentially implodes upon himself. Much of his identity and compensation for deeds have been predicated on receiving Achilles' arms. Hopkinson comments that Ovid means for us to recall Sophocles' *Ajax* in which Ajax mentions several times that Hector gave him his sword after the duel in *Iliad* 7.206–312.[223] Since their duel was a draw and ended when night began to fall, they exchange gifts and in that way are equally compensated for their toil. It is significant that at the moment before Ajax dies because of a botched instance of exchange rituals, he recalls a successful instance of one and wonders if Ulysses will rob him of that too. In order to prevent further loss of status in the face of the community, he does the only thing he knows how to do—kill himself. As he says, *ne quisquam Aiacem possit superare nisi Aiax* (*Met.* 13.390).

[223] Hopkinson 2000: *ad loc*. For more on the scene in Sophocles' *Ajax* 815ff., see Jebb 2004: *ad loc*. and Finglass 2011: *ad loc*. For more on this episode in *Iliad* 7 see Kirk 1990: *ad loc*.

Ajax's suicide has further significance in the context of the ritual death and rebirth that were essential components of athletic competition.[224] Even the flowers used to make garlands for the victors had funerary implications, and the winner of the contest undergoes a ritual rebirth by being integrated back into his community, whereas the loser undergoes a ritual death.[225] Unlike a loser in athletic games who typically returns home without the spectacle and glory of a reintegration ceremony, Ajax actually dies as a consequence of losing the competition. Not only has ritual been made into real life, but also the placement of praise in this particular contest exacerbates the situation and makes reintegration impossible for Ajax. Because he first praises himself and then fails to win the competition, Ajax becomes stuck in no man's land. He has already done the praising which would integrate him back into the community, but his status as a loser makes the actual integration impossible. Because of the praise which has elevated him, he cannot slink back home in the manner of someone who has lost, but he cannot be successfully reintegrated. Athletes who fail to win anything do not receive the same praise and reintegration afforded to the victor.[226] Pindar twice discusses the way in which losers in athletic competitions slink home. In *Olympian* 8.68–70, those who fail to win experience a hateful return, people saying nasty things, and an obscure path, νόστον

[224] Burkert 1985:106, Nagy 1990:117–119. It is also quite possible to argue that there is still a component of this in contemporary competition.

[225] Nagy 1990:119.

[226] I suspect that Pindar would have quite a few things to say about today's unfortunate "everyone gets a medal" mentality and awards for mere participation.

ἔχθιστον καὶ ἀτιμοτέραν γλῶσσαν καὶ ἐπόκρυφον οἶμον. In *Pythian* 8, Pindar elaborates on their ignominious return.

> τοῖς οὔτε νόστος ὁμῶς
> ἔπαλπνος ἐν Πυθιάδι κ'ρίθη,
> οὐδὲ μολόντων πὰρ ματέρ' ἀμφὶ γέλως γλυκύς
> ὦρσεν χάριν· κατὰ λαύρας δ' ἐχθρῶν ἀπάοροι
> πτώσσοντι, συμφορᾷ δεδαγμένοι
>
> *Pythian* 8.83–87

> for whom no homecoming as happy as yours
> was decided at the Pythian festial,
> nor upon returning to their mothers did sweet laughter
> arouse joy all around: but staying clear of their enemies
> they shrink down alleyways, bitten by failure.

Pindar's losers do not actually die, needless to say, but they come home in obscurity and do not experience the glorious ritual rebirth and integration back into their communities. Since they have not been praised and exalted above everyone else, there is no need for a reintegration because they are not subject to *phthonos*. Ajax, however, finds himself in an impossible place. He has praised himself but has not won. This situation is the worst of all possible situations. His self-praise has made him a possible target for envy from the other members of the community, but because he has not actually triumphed, he cannot be reintegrated in the manner of a victory. Accordingly, Ajax implodes and commits suicide.

## Conclusion

The question still remains: why does Ulysses' speech succeed when it should fail? As mentioned previously, Ulysses' speech is the only instance in the entire Ovidian corpus in which a lengthy, well-crafted display of rhetoric succeeds.[227] As mentioned above, praising oneself is ritually inappropriate, and Ulysses should experience a failure similar to Ajax. In order to adequately explain this, we need to define what constitutes a success in this context. Ulysses' speech does accomplish his intended purpose: he persuades the Achaean generals and wins the arms of Achilles. But at what cost? The Achaeans are deprived of their second-best warrior after Achilles as a result of Ajax's suicide. Furthermore, any reader of the *Metamorphoses* can see that Ulysses' argument is based on dubious facts, outright lies, e.g. his role in carrying Achilles' body back to the Achaeans, and leaps of logic, e.g. taking credit for all of Achilles' accomplishments. As Tarrant comments, "... the import of Ulysses' speech is thoroughly negative, showing how dishonest rhetoric can extort an unjust victory from an audience wanting in discernment."[228] Ovid himself even hints at the unfairness of Ulysses' victory with the lines immediately after Ulysses ends his speech.

> mota manus procerum est, et quid facundia posset
> re patuit, fortisque uiri tulit arma disertus.
>
> *Metamorphoses* 13.382–383

[227] Tarrant 1995:72 also points to Orpheus' speech as a success. Many thanks as well to RJT for helping me figure out how to conclude this chapter!

[228] Tarrant 1995:72. See also Anderson 1963:22–23.

> The company of chiefs was moved, and their decision proved the power of eloquence: to the eloquent man were given the brave man's arms.

Although *facundia* is an accurate noun for Ulysses' talents, it has a slightly pejorative connotation. It can refer to eloquence or fluency and derives from *for*, *fari*.[229] All of this should come as no surprise. However, Benveniste comments that *for* is distinct from other forms of verbs in Latin that are related to speaking, in that it indicates the ability to form words, regardless of whether or not they are true:

> The term fabula is applied to a legend, an action, or anything which is put into words. Whether it is a narrative, a fable, or a play, the only relevant aspect is this transposition into words. This explains why fabula denotes what is nothing but words, what has no basis in reality. This is the way in which we must understand the other derivatives of the root: facundus 'who is talented in speaking', a verbal manifestation considered independently of its content; not one who is eloquent, but one who has a great abundance of words at his disposal.[230]

If we think about Ovid's use of *facundia* in these terms, Ulysses' victory seems negatively portrayed here. In addition, *facundia* and *fama* come from the same root, and Ovid's description of *fama* at the beginning of *Metamorphoses* 12 should also be kept in mind.[231] Ulysses would seem to be *fama* personified throughout his speech. Moreover, there are two ways to read *fortisque uiri tulit arma disertus* (*Met.* 13.383). One could read *fortis viri* as referring either to Achilles or to

[229] OLD s.v.

[230] Benveniste 1973:412.

[231] Benveniste 1973:412.

Ajax. If we interpret *fortis viri* as referring to Ajax, then the line indicates that Ulysses carried off the arms that belonged to Ajax. Ulysses "wins" in the context of the contest, but unlike a victory that benefits a victor's community, this victory only results in the death of Ajax. Again, we return to *Nemean* 7 and Pindar's statement that Homer has exaggerated Odysseus' sufferings with the result that he receives an undue amount of *kleos*. Ovid's Ulysses, however, does not need Homer. He manufactures his own *kleos*, but at a tremendous cost to everyone involved.

# Conclusion
# From a Certain Point of View: Subversive Praise in *Metamorphoses* 15

## Introduction

The primary questions regarding Ovid's praise of Augustus at the end of *Metamorphoses* 15 concern its sincerity and potentially subversive aspects. Although, upon first reading, Ovid does appear to praise Augustus during his description of Julius Caesar's apotheosis and beyond, most critics agree that Ovid and Augustus were not on the best of terms at this point in Ovid's career. Needless to say, in light of this situation, Ovid would be unlikely to praise Augustus unequivocally.[232] Ovid uses the basic structures and tropes of praise poetry as we see in Pindar, Horace, and others but not to praise Augustus and the Caesars—Ovid himself is the *laudandus*. In this way, he conducts himself in a manner similar to Ulysses in *Metamorphoses* 13 by using the characteristics of praise poetry for self-praise. When we view the end of the *Metamorphoses* through a Pindaric lens, we see that Ovid uses the basic principles of praise poetry to praise his own poetry as well as the power of poetry and discourse in general while ostensibly praising Augustus and Julius Caesar.

When one mentions panegyric, praise, and Pindar in Latin poetry, Ovid would perhaps be the furthest poet from one's mind. Indeed, Virgil, Horace, and Propertius were more prone to perform praise poetry. Virgil, Horace, and Propertius all praised Maecenas and Augustus to

[232] Segal 1969:296–299.

some extent.[233] However, Ovid, as a "smiling destroyer," as Conte calls him, or a "smirking destroyer," as I prefer to see him, does not seem to be the sort of author who would happily and unabashedly engage in praise of anyone, let alone the person responsible for his exile.[234] If it is possible to determine anything about an author's personality and sense of humor from his or her work, then Ovid seems to have been irreverent, witty, and not inclined towards the type of praise we see in Horace, Virgil, or even Pindar, for that matter. Indeed, any hint of panegyric or praise of Augustus and the Augustan regime in Ovid seems to alert the reader immediately that something subversive lurks beneath the surface. Two salient examples of this tendency include *Ars Amatoria* 1.179–238 and *Amores* 1.2.19–52. In the *Ars*, Ovid begins what seems like a panegyric to Gaius Caesar and his victories, but then concludes by discussing the triumphal procession as an excellent way to meet women. In *Amores* 1.2.19–52, Ovid parodies a triumphal procession but ends the poem by discussing Caesar's mercy. This inclination towards irreverence and humor is why there are multiple interpretations of Ovid's true aim in the closing lines of *Metamorphoses* 15, and (almost) no one takes his praise of Julius and Augustus Caesar at face value, especially at this point in time.[235] As Moulton comments,

---

[233] See the Pindar in Rome section of my introduction for relevant bibliography on Pindar, praise, and Virgil, Horace, and Propertius.

[234] Conte 1999:257.

[235] Fränkel 1945, Wilkinson 1955:224ff., and Otis 1966:300–340, however, want to read the end of the *Metamorphoses* as Ovid's sincere attempt to praise Augustus. Segal 1969 and 2000, Moulton 1973, Syme 1978, Barchiesi 1997a, Gold 2004, et al disagree.

"Anyone reading the last hundred lines in an age with few emperors might find the flattery a little difficult to swallow."[236] That said, there are those who see nothing amiss at all about Ovid's praise of the Caesars and find no reason to doubt Ovid's sincerity while doing so.[237]

Of course Ovid would not be the first Latin poet to make use of the Pindaric paradigm while engaging in praise or ostensible praise. Horace, most notably in 1.12 during which he freely makes use of *Olympian* 2 as well as throughout *Odes* 4, uses allusions to Pindar for the purposes of praising Maecenas and Augustus.[238] As Conte observes, most of the Augustan poets avoided the sort of unabashed praise we see in Pindar, Bacchylides, etc., but in their use of recusatio praised Augustus tangentially.[239] Ovid, depending on his proximity to exile at this point in his career, had to participate in praise of Augustus and his regime ostensibly in order to either attempt to avoid exile or finagle his way back into Augustus' or Tiberius' good graces in order to return to Rome. The epinician paradigm, though filtered through the lens of Horace, Callimachus, among others, allows Ovid to situate his praise of Augustus in an easily recognizable form while simultaneously being sneakily subversive.

## Ovid, Exile, Augustus, and Panegyric: Some Background

[236] Moulton 1973:5.

[237] For an interpretation along these lines, see Scott 1930.

[238] See Thomas 2011 for more on praise in *Odes* 4 as well as Johnson 2005.

[239] Conte 1999:276.

However, one cannot adequately interpret the end of *Metamorphoses* 15 without addressing the question of Ovid's proximity to his exile and relationship with Augustus at this point in time. As we all know, Ovid and Augustus were not on the best of terms at the end of Ovid's career. As a result of *carmen et error*, Augustus banished him to Tomis, where he lived out the remainder of his life and wrote the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex ponto*. Most agree that the *carmen* in question was the *Ars Amatoria*, which did not fall in line with Augustus' moral legislation, namely the *lex Iulia*.[240] Ovid himself confirms that the *Ars Amatoria* contributed to his exile during his defense of the poem in *Tristia* 2. The *error*, however, remains unclear. Ovid does compare himself to Actaeon in *Tristia* 2, which has led many to speculate that he saw something he should have not seen or was in possession of information that could be rather embarrassing to Augustus and his associates.[241] There does seem to be some connection between Augustus' granddaughter's torrid affair with Silanus, which resulted in her exile, and *Ars Amatoria* 3, which, needless to say, was not a good thing for Ovid.[242] Syme, however, argues that Julia's alleged affair did not happen and was instead part of a political plot to remove her, and that Ovid somehow became involved in it and was deemed guilty by association.[243] Based on the

[240] For more on the *Ars Amatoria* and its immoral aspects, see Kenney 1958:208, Green 1982:206 and many others.

[241] Green 1982:207–208.

[242] Rodgers 1966:370, Goold 1983 thinks that Ovid somehow aided and abetted Julia in her relationship with Silanus and that this along with the *Ars* prompted Augustus to exile him. For an extremely thorough and exhaustive analysis of every conceivable theory concerning Ovid's *error*, see Thibault 1964.

[243] Syme 1978:219. See also Green 1982:213–220.

geographical errors in Ovid's description of Tomi and the fact that no later authors mention Ovid's exile, some have theorized that Ovid's "exile" was entirely fiction and some sort of elaborate literary conceit.[244] The speculations regarding the causes, circumstances, and plausibility of Ovid's exile are so numerous that some have declared determining them as an "exercise in sheer futility."[245] Regardless of whether Ovid was actually exiled or not and regardless of the cause, the fact remains that Ovid presents himself as an exile. The dilemma concerns Ovid's proximity to his alleged exile while he was writing the *Metamorphoses* and how that might have affected his representation of the Caesars and what seems to be praise of Augustus at the end of the poem. Thibault believes that Ovid was exiled in 8 CE and probably arrived in Tomis during 9 CE.[246] Given that Ovid most likely reworked the *Fasti* when he had heard the news of exile and that the Metamorphoses were published before the *Fasti*, it is ambiguous as to whether Ovid was potentially aware of his impending exile before writing the final part of the *Metamorphoses*.[247] That said, Ovid's explicit reference to the *ira Iouis* (*Met.* 15.871) combined with the connections between Augustus and Jupiter in the *Metamorphoses*

[244] Fitton Brown 1985 is the most ardent disbeliever in Ovid's exile. He even includes a temperature chart of Tomis from the late 1970s to show that Ovid's description of the frigid climate in the region is false and has apparently never heard of poetic license or climate change.

[245] Rodgers 1966:376.

[246] Thibault 1964:12–13.

[247] Fränkel 1945:111 thinks that Ovid had some idea of his impending exile while revising the final book of the *Metamorphoses*, and I agree.

seem to indicate that Ovid was aware of a deteriorating relationship between Augustus and him.

## Augustus and the End in the Broader Context of *Metamorphoses* 15

Even by Ovid's standards, the fifteenth book of the *Metamorphoses* is a strange book, as many scholars have noted. It is the point in the poem at which Ovid fulfills his promise in the proem to bring his narrative *ad mea tempora* from the primordial material that he describes in the first four hundred lines of the first book. Brooks Otis comments that *Metamorphoses* 15, especially the panegyric to the Caesars at the end, does not appear to fit with the rest of the poem and is emblematic of "a poet at war with his subject matter."[248] Prominently featured are characters who either are or are in the process of being banished from their homes or having to leave for some reason, Pythagoras' lengthy diatribe about the merits of a vegetarian life and the transmigration of souls, Asclepius' journey to Rome as a large snake, and then finally Julius Caesar's assassination and subsequent deification. In terms of structure, many have noted that there are a number of thematic connections between *Metamorphoses* 1 and 15. Ovid only refers to Caesar's assassination in these two books: during the *concilium deorum* in the Lycaon episode

[248] Otis 1966:339. See also Segal 1969, as well as Davis 1980 for more on the bizarre aspects of Book 15. Fränkel 1945:107–108 thinks that Ovid "lost his bearings" beginning with Book 12 and views 15 as an attempt to compete with both Virgil and Lucretius.

and the end of *Metamorphoses* 15.[249] Other links to the first book include Ovid's description of Numa *animo maiora capaci* / *concipit* (*Met*. 15.6) with humans at the beginning of the world, *animal mentisque capacius altae* (*Met.* 1.76). Tages' discovery of the clod of dirt recalls the formation of the earth and animals after the flood.

> … cum Tyrrhenus arator
> fatalem glaebam mediis aspexit in aruis
> sponte sua primum nulloque agitante moueri
>
> *Metamorphoses* 15.553–555

> than was the Tyrrhene plowman when he saw in his fields
> a clod, big with fate, first moving of its own accord

> cetera diuersis tellus animalia formis
> sponte sua peperit …
> plurima cultores uersis animalia glaebis
> inueniunt
>
> *Metamorphoses* 1.416–417, 425–426

> As to the other forms of animal life, the earth spontaneously
> produced these of diverse kinds …
> farmers as they turn over the lumps of earth
> find many animate things

Lest we forget, Jupiter was responsible for the earth's destruction and recreation in *Metamorphoses* 1. This connection combined with Ovid's reference to the *ira Iovis* and comparison of Augustus and Jupiter at the end of the poem does not cast Augustus in a

[249] There is some debate as to whether the assassination Ovid mentions at *Met.* 1.200–205 was Julius Caesar's assassination or an attempt on Augustus' life. See Anderson 1989:93n4 for more.

flattering light. On the one hand, it is certainly possible to argue that Jupiter and Augustus are similar in eradicating wrongdoers from the community in order to preserve the safety of all. However, Ovid's presentation of Jupiter as a ruthless ruler in the Lycaon episode seems to reflect negatively on Augustus. In addition to these connections with the first book, there are two aspects of *Metamorphoses* 15 that concern us when juxtaposed with Ovid's panegyric to Augustus in the closing lines: the large concentration of exiles in the first half of the book and Caesar's assassination.

While several notable characters in the *Metamorphoses* are forced to leave their homes for some reason (cf. Cadmus in *Metamorphoses* 3), *Metamorphoses* 15 does have a large concentration of exiles. When Numa first arrives in Greece on his trip to find out more about Greek philosophy, he hears about Myscelus from the inhabitants of the region. A vision of Heracles forces Myscelus to leave Argos, *lapidosas Aesaris undas, / i, pete diuersi; patrias, age, desere sedes!* (*Met*. 15.22–23) and threatens terrible things if he does not obey, *nisi paruerit, multa ac metuenda minatur* (*Met*. 15.24). Immediately after Myscelus' story, Numa listens to Pythagoras, whom Ovid describes as *odioque tyrannidis exul / sponte erat* (*Met*. 15.61–62). After Pythagoras finishes his lengthy diatribe about the importance of vegetarianism and the transmigration of souls, Egeria, Numa's widow, encounters Hippolytus while grieving for

Numa. Hippyolytus tells us that he too is an exile, *meritumque nihil pater eicit urbe* (*Met*. 15.504), *mihi mens interrita mansit / exiliis contenta suis* (*Met*. 15.514–515).[250]

The list of exiles conclude with Cipus who becomes an exile voluntarily in order to avoid ascending to a position of political power, *multoque ego iustius aeuum / exule agam quam me videant Capitolia regem* (*Met*. 15.588–589). Cipus has additional significance when viewed in terms of Augustus.[251] Barchiesi comments that Cipus hiding his horns by means of a laurel wreath could be interpreted as emblematic of an ulterior motive.[252] As discussed in Chapter 1 during the Apollo and Daphne episode, the laurel wreath had important significance for Augustus and was extremely common in Augustan iconography.[253] Ovid implicitly connects the two by having Cipus wear a laurel wreath just as in Daphne's transformation in *Metamorphoses* 1. Although one could interpret Cipus' disavowal of political power a favorable analogy to Augustus, Ovid's description of the vast quantity of land he gains from refusing to be king seems to indicate that he acquires an empire, *ad finem lucis ab ortu* (*Met.* 15.619).[254] The increasing concentration of exiles culminating in a figure comparable to Augustus cannot be coincidental and furthermore suggests that Ovid had some inkling of his own impending exile.

---

[250] Fränkel 1945:111n105 notes that Ovid echoes Hippolytus' words at *Met*. 15.514–515, 521–526 in *Tristia* 1.3.7–12, 73–76.

[251] See Bömer 1969: *ad loc*., Barchiesi 1997a:185–187, Marks 2004.

[252] Barchiesi 1997a:186.

[253] Cf. Chapter 1. See also Galinksy 1967:186–187 and Barchiesi 1997a:186.

[254] Barchiesi 1997a:186–188.

## Conventional Praise … Or Not

Ovid transitions abruptly from Asclepius to Caesar in *Metamorphoses* 15.745–746, *hic tamen accesit delubris aduena nostris; / Caesar in urbe sua deus est*. Ovid has used Asclepius as a foil for Caesar and uses the means of capping a foil we see in Pindar and other exempla of praise poetry with a proper name to contrast the foil with his laudandus (cf. *Neman* 2.3).[255] After a nod to Callimachus and Berenices' lock with *stellamque comantem* (*Met*. 15.749), Ovid then begins a catalogue of Caesar's military accomplishments, but without a satisfactory crescendo and climax. Rather than ending the catalogue in a Pindaric vein by specifically mentioning Caesar's most significant triumph, Ovid's catalogue ends with a whimper rather than a bang by referring to unnamed accomplishments *et multos meruisse, aliquos egisse triumphos* (*Met.* 15.757) before mentioning that Caesar's greatest achievement was having Augustus as his son. Race and Bundy both note that Pindar's catalogues tend to become increasingly more specific as they progress in order to intensify the praise for his *laudandus*.[256] In addition to the unclimactic catalogue, Ovid's dismissal of Julius Caesar's accomplishments in favor of those of his adopted son should also give us pause. Though parents and offspring occur frequently in Pindar, Pindar never diminishes the accomplishments of one to praise the other. The son's achievements do not compete with those of his ancestors; rather, they illuminate them and confer further glory

[255] Bundy 1962:7.

[256] Race 1991:9–10. See also Bundy 1962:20ff.

on the family.[257] Lessening Julius Caesar's victories in battle to augment Augustus' successes ultimately diminishes the praise of both of them.

When he finally reaches Augustus, Ovid does not even name him and only refers to him as *tantum uirum* (*Met.* 15.758), which is unusual in terms of panegyric and praise poetry, especially since Augustus along with Julius is one of the ostensible *laudandi* here. Apart from the structural irregularities of this passage, Ovid also emphasizes the fact that Augustus is not Julius' biological son by using language related to birth and succession, namely *genuisse* (*Met.* 15.758) and *mortali semine cretus* (*Met.* 15.760), which casts even more doubt on the sincerity of Ovid's praise here.[258] Ovid begins with what appears to be the conventional structural mechanisms of praise poetry, but then thwarts the reader's expectations and, in the process, diminishes his supposed praise of Augustus.

Ovid then begins a quasi-mythical digression by narrating the circumstances surrounding Caesar's assassination and apotheosis, which we would expect from Pindar and other exempla of praise poetry. However, as we would expect from Ovid, all is not as it seems. First, descriptions of terrible situations in detail generally do not occur in praise poetry. Pindar does refer to catastrophic events; however, he usually does not narrate them in detail and uses

[257] In Pindar, see *Olympian* 8.81ff., 10.91ff., *Pythian* 6.14ff., etc. See also Kurke 1991:43ff.

[258] Segal 2001:89–90.

them as breakoff formulae (cf. the gods eating Pelops in *Olympian* 1, *Olympian* 13, etc.).[259] This excruciating narrative of Caesar's death contrasts markedly with how Ovid discusses the assassination in *Fasti* 3 in which Ovid hesitates to narrate it until Venus does so, *praeteriturus eram gladios in principe fixos, / cum sic a castis Vesta locuta focis* (*Fast*. 3.697–698).[260]

In terms of content, Ovid's description of how Venus nearly prevents Caesar's assassination could be interpreted as unflattering to both Julius and Augustus Caesar.

> tum uero Cytherea manu percussit utraque
> pectus et Aeneaden molitur condere nube,
> qua prius infesto Paris est ereptus Atridae
> et Diomedeos Aeneas fugerat enses.
>
> *Metamorphoses* 15.803–806

> Then indeed did Cytherea smite on her
> breast with both her hands and strive to hide her Caesar in a cloud
> in which of old Paris had been rescued from the murderous
> Atrides and in which Aeneas had escaped the sword of Diomede.

In 805, Ovid recalls the embarrassing duel between Menelaus and Paris in *Iliad* 3 in which Paris only escapes death at Menelaus' hands because Aphrodite interferes and whisks him away in a cloud. Although Romans like to claim ancestry from the Trojans, no one would want to follow Paris' example. He presents another instance of Aphrodite/Venus snatching away a Trojan about to die in 806, but she removes Aeneas from Diomedes. Needless to say, given that Aeneas

[259] For a more detailed analysis of how Pindar does this with more exempla, see Race 1990:44–53 and Mackie 2003:9–37.

[260] See Fantham 2002:198–199 for more about this.

occupies an important position in Roman *Ktissisagen*, reminding a Roman reader of a time when he had to be removed from battle by a literal *deus ex machina*, is markedly subversive, especially during an account of Caesar's apotheosis. Ovid also strikes a humorous note in this passage since it would be ludicrous that Venus had the exact same cloud she used in the Homeric epics at hand. The implicit humor detracts from the more elevated aspects of this episode.[261]

As many have discussed, Ovid models Jupiter's speech to Venus in *Metamorphoses* 15 on Jupiter's assuaging of Venus' fears about Aeneas in *Aeneid* 1.[262] However, there is one notable difference. In *Aeneid* 1, Jupiter knows the outcome of events and does not rely on an external source for confirmation. Ovid's Jupiter, however, does not simply know the forthcoming events; rather he has to consult tablets.

> talibus hanc genitor: 'sola insuperabile fatum,
> nata, mouere paras? intres licet ipsa sororum
> tecta trium; cernes illic molimine uasto
> ex aere et solido rerum tabularia ferro,
> quae neque concursum caeli neque fulminis iram
> nec metuunt ullas tuta atque aeterna ruinas.
> inuenies illic incisa adamante perenni
> fata tui generis; legi ipse animoque notaui
> et referam, ne sis etiamnum ignara futuri.
>
> *Metamorphoses* 15.807–815

[261] Thanks to RJT for pointing this out.

[262] Otis 1966:304–305, Bömer 1969: *ad loc*., Smith 1997:120–124, Barchiesi 2001:74, Thomas 2001:78–92, Gladhill 2012:1.

> Thou
> thyself mayst enter the abode of the three sisters. Thou shalt there behold the records of all that happens on tablets of brass and solid iron, a massive structure, tablets which fear neither warfare in the heavens, nor the lightning's fearful power, nor any destructive shocks which may befall, being eternal and secure. There shalt thou find engraved on everlasting adamant thy descendant's fates. I have myself read these and marked them well in mind; and these will I relate, that thou mayst be no longer ignorant of that which is to come.

Jupiter's reliance on tablets undermines his ultimate authority as *rex hominum deorumque*, especially since an educated reader of the *Metamorphoses* would be familiar with the comparable passage in *Aeneid* 1. Segal comments that Jupiter acts "like a contemporary Roman official, proud of his efficiency."[263] As in the Lycaon episode in which Ovid's anachronisms undercut the epic grandeur of the *concilium deorum*, portraying Jupiter as a bureaucrat in this instance has a similar effect.[264] Within Jupiter's prophecy, Ovid continues using language related to biological relationships as he did while describing Julius Caesar's victories, *natusque suus* (*Met*. 15.819), *heres* (*Met*. 15.819), *parentis* (*Met.* 15.820) which highlights the fact that Augustus and Julius are not biologically related.[265] Jupiter also goes into detail about Augustus' victories, all of which Augustus perhaps might have preferred to have left unsaid since the

[263] Segal 2000:90. Gladhill 2012:25.

[264] See also Wickkiser 1999:124.

[265] Segal 2000:90–91.

ostensible point of this prophecy is that Augustus will usher in a golden age of peace and harmony.[266] Finally, Jupiter potentially mocks Augustus' moral legislation with *exemploque suo mores reget* (*Met.* 15.834). According to Suetonius, Augustus himself was notoriously promiscuous and had sexual relations with a number of women.[267] Jupiter's prophecy both undermines Augustus' authority and Ovid's praise of Augustus.

After Jupiter's prophecy and Caesar's assassination, Ovid shifts into what seems to be a more conventional panegyric mode.

> sic magnus cedit titulis Agamemnonis Atreus,
> Aegea sic Theseus, sic Pelea uicit Achilles;
> denique, ut exemplis ipsos aequantibus utar,
> sic et Saturnus minor est Iove. Iuppiter arces
> temperat aetherias et mundi regna triformis,
> terra sub Augusto est; pater est et rector uterque.
>
> *Metamorphoses* 15.855–860

> So does the great Atreus yield in honour
> to his son, Agamemnon; so does Theseus rival Aegeus, and
> Achilles, Peleus; finally, to quote an instance worthy of them both,
> is Saturn less than Jove. Jupiter controls the heights
> of heaven and the kingdoms of the triformed universe; but the
> earth is under Augustus' sway. Each is both sire and ruler.

A priamel that lists several mythological exempla before settling on the subject of the poet's choice is certainly not uncommon to many varieties of poetry, though it is one of the most

[266] See also Gladhill 2012:16–23.

[267] Suetonius, *Augustus* 68–69. Gold 2004:133–134.

common features of epinician and lyric poetry, as we see in Pindar, Horace, etc.[268] Ovid, as one would expect, alters the typical order of gods, heroes, and men. When Pindar cycles through a list of important figures before mentioning his laudandus, he typically lists them in the following order: gods, heroes, and men (cf. the opening of *Olympian* 2 et al.). Horace in *Odes* 1.12 reverses this pattern by listing men, heroes, and gods. Ovid alters this sequence further by beginning with heroes (Agamemnon, Atreus, Aegeus, Theseus, Peleus, Achilles), then moves to gods (Saturn and Jove) and finishes with Augustus, a human being. Does Ovid anticipate Augustus' apotheosis here? Perhaps, since he does say that both Jupiter and Augustus are *pater est et rector uterque* (*Met.* 15.860). But why would he leave out mortal men? Yes, Augustus is the cap of this particular priamel, as one would expect, but is he a god or a man? The answer is ambiguous and perhaps intentionally so. Placing Augustus and Jupiter on what would seem to be equal footing further links them, as we saw in *Metamorphoses* 1. Apart from the odd nature of this structure, Moulton further points out that Ovid's comparison of Julius and Augustus to this list of fathers and sons is not entirely complimentary and asks, "can any of these *really* be considered laudatory analogies of the Caesars?"[269] Indeed, when one considers Atreus's violation of *xenia*, Agamemnon's conduct in the *Iliad* and subsequent death at the hands of Clytemnestra in his own bathtub, Theseus' role in Aegeus' death, Saturn's cannibalistic

[268] Bundy 1962:10–12, Race 1991:10ff.

[269] Moulton 1973:6. Original emphasis. See also Feeney 1991:222–224.

tendencies, and Jupiter's parricide, interpreting any of these comparisons as flattering becomes difficult, to say the least. If we look back to Ovid's description of the Golden Age in *Metamorphoses* 1, Saturn ruled the Golden Age, and Jupiter is an agent of decline.[270] In light of Ovid's comparison of Jupiter and Augustus, this is not complimentary.

The remaining lines of *Metamorphoses* 15 do sound reminiscent of Pindar's concluding prayers in his epinician poems, even including Ovid's statement about his own poetry at the very end of the *Metamorphoses*. At the end of his epinician works, Pindar often includes both a prayer for the wellbeing of his laudandus and one for the survival of his poetry (cf. *Olympian* 1.109ff., 6.96ff., etc.). Ovid seems to follow suit with *di precor* (15.861) and his prayers to specifically Roman deities (15.862–867) in the same way that Pindar includes prayers to the gods who are important to his victor's hometown. Ovid works in a similar fashion, albeit with a twist at the end of this prayer.

> tarda sit illa dies et nostro serior aeuo,
> qua caput Augustum, quem temperat, orbe relicto
> accedat caelo faueatque precantibus absens.
>
> *Metamorphoses* 15.868–870

> far distant
> be that day and later than our own time when Augustus,
> abandoning the world he rules, shall mount to heaven and there,
> removed from our presence, listen to our prayers!

[270] See Segal 2000:83–85 for more on Jupiter's role in decline.

As many have noted, the final part of this section ends with *absens*, which is strange, especially when contrasted with *uiuam* at the end of the poem.[271] Barchiesi points out that the time when Ovid uses a form of *absens* with respect to a deity is Robigo in *Fasti* 4, *at tu ne viola Cererem, semperque colonus / absenti possit solvere vota tibi* (*Fasti* 4.931–932).[272] Needless to say, referring to Robigo and Augustus with the same adjective seems unflattering. Ovid's use of *absens* here contrasts with the opening of this section in which he refers to the Muses as *praesentia numina vatum* (*Met.* 15.622).[273]

As many have discussed, the very end of the *Metamorphoses* is intriguing, to say the least, especially when juxtaposed with the prior 870 lines.

> iamque opus exegi, quod nec Iovis ira nec ignis
> nec poterit ferrum nec edax abolere uetustas.
> cum uolet, illa dies, quae nil nisi corporis huius
> ius habet, incerti spatium mihi finiat aeui;
> parte tamen meliore mei super alta perennis
> astra ferar, nomenque erit indelebile nostrum;
> quaque patet domitis Romana potentia terris
> ore legar populi, perque omnia saecula fama
> (siquid habent ueri uatum praesagia) uiuam.
>
> *Metamorphoses* 15.871–879

And now my work is done, which neither the wrath of Jove,

[271] Moulton 1973:7.

[272] Barchiesi 1997a:195–196.

[273] Holleman 1971:460–461.

> nor fire, nor sword, nor the gnawing tooth of time shall ever be able to undo. When it will, let that day come which has no power save over this mortal frame, and end the span of my uncertain years. Still in my better part I shall be borne immortal far beyond the lofty stars and I shall have an undying name. Wherever Rome's power extends over the conquered world, I shall have mention on men's lips, and, if the prophecies of bards have any truth, through all the ages shall I live in fame.

He uses many of the stock topoi of praise poetry while nodding to Horace 3.30 with *iamque opus exegi*, as many have noticed.[274] However, Ovid replaces the natural disasters, which Horace envisions as a threat to the survival of his poetry with political perils.[275] In this final sphragis of the *Metamorphoses*, Ovid outdoes both Caesars on multiple levels.[276] Ovid and his text will rise above the heavens, whereas Julius and Augustus Caesar are simply among the stars.[277] Barchiesi notes that Ovid replaces the natural causes of decay that Horace mentions in 3.30 with politically driven parallels, which are intensified when we consider how Augustus is compared to Jupiter.[278] Theodorakopoulos points out that in other notable descriptions of Rome and poetic immortality, the Capitol and Rome generally plays a large role, but that Ovid's immortality is not linked to any of that; rather, he looks to the edge of the boundaries of the

[274] Bömer 1969: *ad loc*., Barchiesi 1997a:194.

[275] Barchiesi 1997a:194–195. See also Moulton 1973:7.

[276] Fränkel 1945:110 describes this as "one sharp clarion note of defiance."

[277] Feeney 1991:249, Barchiesi 1997a:194.

[278] Barchiesi 1997a:195–196.

empire.[279] These last few lines are that towards which *Metamorphoses* 15 has been building, beginning with exilic figures and finally a statement of triumph that yes, he will survive. Ovid echoes Jupiter's language about the permanence of the tablets, As Segal comments, he "appropriates for himself both the prophetic voice of Jupiter and the immortality that the Virgilian machinery of the *fata* promises to the Julian line."[280] In the process, he undermines the praise of Caesar a few lines earlier. The true *laudandi* of the end of *Metamorphoses* 15 are Ovid and his poetry, and everything leading up to 871 has been a foil.

As many have noted, Ovid ends the *Metamorphoses* on a triumphant and subversive note. When viewed through the lens of epinician poetry, we see that Ovid's deviation from its norms enhances the subversive aspects and gives Ovid another way to undermine the authority of Augustus.

## Conclusion

Throughout the course of this dissertation, I hope to have shown that reading selected episodes of the *Metamorphoses* while keeping Pindar and the conventions of epinician poetry in mind can shed new light on aspects of the episodes that might otherwise be left in shadow or ἐν σκότῳ as Pelops says in *Olympian* 1.83. Reading the Apollo and Daphne episode alongside *Pythian* 9 illuminates Apollo's concern with marriage while pursuing Daphne and violent

[279] Theodorakopoulous 1999:147–148, 152.

[280] Segal 2001:91.

aspects of Roman *Ktissisagen*. Lycaon's transformation into a wolf when analyzed in terms of praise and blame poetry shows how keen Ovid was to undercut Jupiter and possibly Augustus by extension. Looking at the structures of praise poetry clues us in to a possible rationale behind Ulysses' speech in Ovid's account of the *armorum iudicium* in *Metamorphoses* 13. Finally, we see that Ovid uses the structures and topoi of praise poetry subversively in *Metamorphoses* 15. Although Ovid is most likely the last poet one would normally think of while considering the place of praise poetry in Latin literature, it does comprise an important element of the *Metamorphoses* and enriches our understanding of this wonderfully slippery and multivalent text.

# Bibliography


Acosta-Hughes, B. 2002. *Polyeideia*: *The* Iambi *of Callimachus and the Archaic Iambic Tradition*. Berkeley

———. 2010. *Arion's Lyre: Archaic Lyric into Hellenistic Poetry*. Princeton.

Acosta-Hughes, B. and S. Stephens. 2012. *Callimachus in Context*. Cambridge.

Adamesteanu, D., V. Cristea, and E. Lozovan, eds. 1953. *Ovidiana*. Paris.

Anderson, W.S. 1972. *Ovid's Metamorphoses: Books 6–10*. Norman.

———. 1963. "Multiple Changes in the *Metamorphoses*." *TAPA* 94: 1–27.

———. 1989. "Lycaon: Ovid's Deceptive Paradigm in *Metamorphoses* I." *CJ* 90(3): 265–269.

———. 1995. *Ovid's Metamorphoses: Books 1–5.* Norman

Balot, R.K. 1998. "Pindar, Virgil, and the Proem to *Georgic* 3." *Phoenix* 52: 83–94.

Barbantani, S. 2009. "Lyric in the Hellenistic Period and Beyond." In F. Budelmann, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Lyric*: 297–318. Cambridge; New York.

Barchiesi, A. 1996. "Poetry, Praise, and Patronage: Simonides in Book 4 of Horace's *Odes*." *CA* 15(1): 5–47.

———. 1997a. "Endgames: Ovid's *Metamorphoses* 15 and *Fasti* 6." In D. Roberts, F.M. Dunn, and D. Fowler, eds., *Classical Closure: Reading the End in Greek and Latin Literature*: 181–208. Princeton.

———. 1997b. *The Poet and the Prince: Ovid and Augustan Discourse*. Berkeley; Los Angeles.

———. 2001. *Speaking Volumes*. Trans. M. Fox and S. Marchesi. London.

———. 2002. "Palingenre: Death, Rebirth, and Horatian Iambos." In M. Paschalis, ed. *Horace and Greek Lyric Poetry*: 47–69. Rethymno.

———. 2009. “Lyric in Augustan Rome.” In F. Budelmann, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Lyric*: 319–335.

Bell, J. 1984. “God, Man, and Animal in Pindar’s Second Pythian.” In D.E. Gerber, ed. *Greek Poetry and Philosophy: Studies in Honor of Leonard Woodbury*: 1–31. Chico, CA.

Benveniste, E. 1973. *Indo-European Language and Society*. Miami.

Bing, P. 1988. *The Well-Read Muse*. Göttingen.

Bömer, F. 1969–1986. *P. Ovidius Naso. Metamorphosen: Kommentar*. Heidelberg.

Bowra, C.M. 1937. “Pindar, *Pythian* II.” *HSCP* 48: 1–28.

———. 1964. *Pindar*. Oxford.

Boyd, B.W., ed. 2002. *Brill’s Companion to Ovid*. Boston; Leiden.

Brown, C.G. 2006. “Pindar on Archilochus and the Gluttony of Blame.” *JHS* 126: 36–46.

Bulman, P. 1992. *Phthonos in Pindar*. Los Angeles.

Bundy, E.L. 1962. *Studia Pindarica*. Berkeley.

Burkert, W. 1983. *Homo Necans*. Trans. P. Bing. Berkeley; Los Angeles.

———. 1985. *Greek Religion: Archaic and Classical.* Trans. J. Raffan. Oxford.

Burnett, A.P. 2005. *Pindar’s Songs for Young Athletes of Aigina*. Oxford; New York.

Bury, J.B. 1890. *The Nemean Odes of Pindar*. London.

Burton, R. W. B. 1962. *Pindar's Pythian Odes. Essays in Interpretation*. Oxford.

Cairns, F. 1972. *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry*. Edinburgh.

Cameron, A. 1995. *Callimachus and His Critics.* Princeton.

Carey, C. 1981. *A Commentary on Five Odes of Pindar: Pythian 2, Pythian 9, Nemean 1, Nemean 7, Isthmian 8*. New York.

Carson, A. 1982. "Wedding at Noon in Pindar's Ninth *Pythian*." *GRBS* 23: 121–128.

Cavarzere, A., A. Aloni, and A. Barchiesi, eds. 2001. *Iambic ideas: Essays on a Poetic Tradition from Archaic Greece to the Late Roman Empire*. Lanham, MD.

Clausen, W. 1964. "An Interpretation of the *Aeneid*." *HSCP* 68: 139–147.

Conte, G.B. 1986. *The Rhetoric of Imitation: Genre and Poetic Memory in Virgil and Other Latin Poets.* Trans. C. Segal. Ithaca.

———. 1994a. *History of Latin Literature*. Trans. J. Solodow. Baltimore.

———. 1994b. *Genres and Readers*. Trans. G. Most. Baltimore.

Cowherd C. 1973. "Pindar, *Pythian* 2. Κατα φοίνισσαν ἐμπολάν." *CJ* 1973 48: 376–377.

Curran, L.C. 1972. "Metamorphosis and Anti-Augustanism." *Arethusa* 5: 71–91.

———. 1978. "Rape and Rape Victims in the *Metamorphoses*." *Arethusa* 11: 213–241.

Davis, G. 1980. "The Problem of Closure in a Carmen Perpetuum: Aspects of a Thematic Recapitulation in Ovid *Met.* 15." *Grazer Beiträge* 9: 123–132.

Davis, P. J. 2006. *Ovid and Augustus: A Political Reading of Ovid's Erotic Poems*. London.

Detienne, M. and Vernant, J.P., eds. 1989. *The Cuisine of Sacrifice Among the Greeks*. Trans. P. Wissing. Chicago; London.

Detienne, M. 1989. "Culinary Practices and the Spirit of Sacrifice." In Detienne and Vernant: 1–20.

Dover, K. 1964. "The Poetry of Archilochus." *Archiloque; sept exposés et discussions par J. Pouilloux [et al.] Vandœuvres-Genève, 26 août-3 septembre 1963*: 183–222. Geneva.

Duc, T. 1994. "Postulat, ut capiat, quae non intellegit, arma (Ov., *Met*. XIII, 295): un discours programmatique?" *Latomus* 53: 126–131.

Due, O. S. 1997. "Ulysses and Aeneas in Ovid." *C&M* 48: 345–358.

Dumezil, G. 1943. *Servius et la fortune*. Paris.

Durand, J.L. 1989. "Greek Animals: Toward a Topology of Edible Bodies." In Detienne and Vernant: 87–118.

Eisner, R. 1952. *Man Into Wolf: An Anthropological Interpretation of Sadism, Masochism, and Lycanthropy*. New York.

Ellsworth, J. D. 1980. "Ovid's *Iliad* (*Metamorphoses* 12.1–13.622)." *Prudentia* 12: 23–29.

Evans, H. B. 1983. *Publica Carmina. Ovid's Books from Exile*. Lincoln.

Fantham, E. 2002. "Ovid's *Fasti*: Politics, History, and Religion." In Boyd: 197–223.

Fantuzzi, M. and R. Hunter, eds. 2004. *Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry*. Cambridge.

Farrell, J. 1992. "Dialogue of Genres in Ovid's 'Lovesong of Polyphemus' (*Metamorphoses* 13.719–897)." *AJP* 113(2): 235–268.

Feeney, D. 1991. *The Gods in Epic: Poets and Critics of the Classical Tradition.* Oxford; New York.

Feldherr, A. 2002. "Metamorphosis in the *Metamorphoses*." In P. Hardie, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid*: 163–179. Cambridge; New York.

———. 2004. "Flaying the Other." *Arethusa* 37(1): 77–87.

Finglass, P.J., ed. 2011. *Sophocles Ajax*. Cambridge.

Finley, J. 1955. *Pindar and Aeschylus*. Cambridge, MA.

Fishwick D. 1991 "Ovid and *Divus Augustus*." *CP* 86: 36–41.

Fitton Brown, A.D. 1985. "The Unreality of Ovid's Exile." *LCM* 10: 18–22.

Fontenrose, J.E. 1940. "Apollo and the Sun-God in Ovid." *AJP* 61(4): 429–444.

———. 1959. *Python. A Study of Delphic Myth and its Origins.* Berkeley; Los Angeles.

Francese, C. 2003/2004. "Daphne, Honor, and Aetiological Action in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*." *CW* 97(2): 153–157.

Fränkel, H. 1945. *Ovid: A Poet Between Two Worlds*. Berkeley; Los Angeles.

Fredericks, B.R.N. 1977. "Divine Wit vs. Divine Folly. Mercury and Apollo in *Metamorphoses* 1–2." *CJ* 72: 244–249.

Fuhrer, T. 1988. "A Pindaric Feature in the Poems of Callimachus." *AJP* 109: 53–68.

———. 1992. *Die Auseinandersetzung mit den Chorlyrikern in den Epinikien des Kallimachos*.

———. 1993. "Callimachus' Epinician Poems." In M. A. Harder, R. F. Regtuit, and G. C. Wakker, eds. *Callimachus*: 79–97. Groningen.

Fulkerson, L. 2006. "Apollo, *Paenitentia*, and Ovid's *Metamorphoses*." *Mnemosyne* 59(3): 388–402.

Galinsky, G. K. 1999. "Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and Augustan Cultural Thematics." In Hardie, Barchiesi, and Hinds: 103–111.

Gernet, L. 1981. *The Anthropology of Ancient Greece*. Trans. J.D.B. Hamilton and B. Nagy. Baltimore.

Ginsberg, W. 1989. "Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and the Politics of Interpretation." *CJ* 84(3): 222–231.

Gladhill, B. 2012. "Gods, Caesars, and Fate in *Aeneid* 1 and *Metamorphoses* 15." *Dictynna* 9: 1–55.

Gold, R. D. 2004. "*Iovis Ira*: Allusion and the Relegation of Ovid." In R.B. Egan and M.A. Joyal, eds., *Daimonopylai: Essays in Classics and the Classical Tradition Presented to Edmund G. Berry*: 127–142. Winnipeg.

Goold, G.P. 1983. "The Cause of Ovid's Exile." *ICS* 8: 94–107.

Gow, A.S.F., ed. 1950. *Theocritus*. Cambridge.

Green, P. 1982. "Carmen et Error: πρόφασις and αἰτία in the Matter of Ovid's Exile." CA 1(2): 202–220.

Grethlein, J. 2011. "Divine, Human and Poetic Time in Pindar, *Pythian* 9." *Mnemosyne* 64(3): 383–409.

Griffin, A.H.F. 1992. "Ovid's Universal Flood." *Hermathena* 152: 39–58.

Grimm, R. E. "Pindar and the Beast." *CP* 57: 1–9.

Gross, N.P. 1979. "Rhetorical Wit and Amatory Persuasion in Ovid." *CJ* 74(4): 305–318.

———. 2000. "Allusion and Rhetorical Wit in Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 13." *Scholia* 9: 54–65.

Hamilton, R. 1974. *Epinikion.* Paris; The Hague.

Hardie, A. 2003. "The Pindaric Sources of Horace *Odes* 1.12." *HSPh* 101: 371–404.

Hardie, P.R. 1993. *The Epic Successors of Virgil: A Study in the Dynamics of a Tradition*. Cambridge.

———. 1997a. "Questions of Authority: The Invention of Tradition in Ovid *Metamorphoses* 15." In T. Habinek and A. Schiesaro, eds. *The Roman Cultural Revolution*: 182–198. Cambridge.

———. 1997b. "Closure in Latin Epic." in D.H. Roberts, F.M. Dunn, and D. Fowler, eds. *Classical Closure*: 157–175. Princeton.

———, Barchiesi, A., and Hinds, S.E., eds. 1999. *Ovidian Transformations: Essays on Ovid's Metamorphoses and its Reception.* Cambridge.

———. 2002a. *Ovid's Poetics of Illusion*. New York; Cambridge.

———. 2002b. "The Historian in Ovid: The Roman History of *Metamorphoses* 14–15." In D.S. Levene and D.P. Nelis, eds. *Clio and the Poets: Augustan Poetry and the Traditions of Ancient Historiography*: 191–209. Leiden.

Harrison, S.J. 1995. "Horace, Pindar, Iullus Antonius, and Augustus: Horace, *Odes* 4.2." In S.J. Harrison, ed., *Homage to Horace: A Bimilleniary Celebration*: 108–127. Oxford.

———. 2002. "Ovid and Genre: Evolutions of an Elegist." In P. Hardie, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid*: 79–94. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hawkins, T. 2008. "Out-Foxing the Wolf-Walker: Lycambes as Performative Rival to Archilochus." *CA* 27(1): 93–114.

Heyworth, S.J. 2001. "Catullian Iambics, Catullian *Iambi*." In Cavarzere, Aloni, and Barchiesi: 117–110.

Higham, T. F. 1958. "Ovid and Rhetoric." In D. Adamesteanu, V. Cristea, and E. Lozovan, eds. *Ovidiana*: 32-48. Paris.

Highbarger, E.L. 1935. "The Pindaric Style of Horace." *TAPA* 66: 222–255.

Hinds, S. 1987. *The Metamorphosis of Persephone: Ovid and the Self-Conscious Muse*. Cambridge.

———. 1998. *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry*. Cambridge.

Holleman, A.W.J. 1971. "Ovid and Politics." *Historia* 20(4): 458–466.

Hollis, A.S. 1996. "Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 1.445ff.: Apollo, Daphne, and the Pythian Crown." *ZPE* 112: 69–73.

Hughes, D.D. 1991. *Human Sacrifice in Ancient Greece*. London.

Hunter, R.L. 2006. *The Shadow of Callimachus: Studies in the Reception of Hellenistic Poetry at Rome*. Cambridge.

———, ed. 2008. *On Coming After: Studies in Post-Classical Greek Literature and Its Reception*. Berlin; New York.

Hutchinson, G. 2007. "Horace and Archaic Greek Lyric Poetry." In S. Harrison, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Horace*: 36–49. Cambridge; New York.

Huyck, J. 1991. *A Commentary on Ovid's* Armorum Iudicium: Metamorphoses *12.216–13.398*. PhD Dissertation. Harvard University.

Instone, S.J. 1990. "Love and Sex in Pindar: Some Practical Thrusts." *BICS* 37: 30–42.

Jacobsen, G.A. 1984. "Apollo and Tereus: Parallel Motifs in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*." *CJ* 80(1): 45–52.

Jebb, R., ed. 2004. *Sophocles. Ajax*. Bristol.

Johnson, T. 2005. *A Symposion of Praise: Horace Returns to Lyric in* Odes *IV*. Madison.

———. 2011. *Horace's Iambic Criticism*. Boston; Leiden.

Johnson, W.R. 1976. *Darkness Visible: A Study of Virgil's* Aeneid. Berkeley.

Jakob, D. J. 1994–1995. "Nature vs. Culture in Pindar's Ninth *Pythian*." *Métis* 9-10: 425–431.

Katz, P. B. 1969. *The Nature and Function of Pindar's Poetic Persona in* Nemean *VII and* Pythian *II*. PhD Dissertation. Columbia University.

Kenney, E.J. 1953. "Nequitiae Poeta." In Adamesteanu, Cristea, and Lozovan: 201–209.

Keith, A. 2002. "Sources and Genres in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*." In Boyd: 235–269.

Kennedy, G. 1972. *The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World*. Princeton.

Kennedy, N. T. 1975. "Pindar and Horace." *AC* 18: 9–24.

Kirk, G.S., ed. 1985–1993. *The Iliad: A Commentary*. Cambridge; New York.

Kerkhecker, A. 1999. *Callimachus' Book of Iambi*. Oxford; New York.

Kirkwood, G.M. 1982. *Selections from Pindar*. Chico, CA.

———. 1984. "Blame and Envy in the Pindaric Epinician." In D.E. Gerber, ed. *Greek Poetry and Philosophy: Studies in Honour of Leonard Woodbury*: 169–184. Chico, CA.

Köhnken, A. 1971. *Die Funktion des Mythos bei Pindar*. Berlin; New York.

Knox, P.E. 1986. *Ovid's* Metamorphoses *and the Tradition of Augustan Poetry*. Cambridge.

———. 1990. "In Pursuit of Daphne." *TAPA* 120: 183–202+385–386

———. 2004. "The Poet and the Second Prince: Ovid in the Age of Tiberius." *MAAR* 49: 1–20.

Kovacs, D. 2009. "Horace, Pindar and the Censorini in *Odes* 4.8." *JRS* 99: 23–35.

Kromer, G. 1975. "Homer and Odysseus in *Nemean* 7.20–27." *CW* 68: 437–438.

Kurke, L. 1988. "The Poet's Pentathlon. Genre in Pindar's First *Isthmian*." *GRBS* 29: 97–113.

———. 1991. *The Traffic in Praise: Pindar and the Poetics of Social Economy*. Ithaca, NY.

Leary, T.J. 1990. "On the Date of Ovid's *Ibis*." *Latomus* 49(1): 99–101.

Lefkowitz, M. 1984. "The Poet as Athlete." *SIFC* 2: 5–12.

Lévi-Strauss, C. 1969. *The Elementary Structures of Kinship*. London.

Lévystone, D. 2005. "La figure d'Ulysse chez les Socratiques: Socrate «polutropos»." *Phreonesis* 50(3): 181–214.

Little, D. A. 1976. “Ovid's Eulogy of Augustus. *Metamorphoses* 15.851–70.” *Prudentia* 8: 19-30.

Lloyd-Jones, H. 1973a. “Modern Interpretations of Pindar. The Second *Pythian* and Seventh *Nemean* Odes.” *JHS* 93: 109–137.

———. 1973b. “La seconda Pitica di Pindaro.” *Kokalos* 28–29: 310–325.

Lyne R.O.A.M. 1971. “Prop. IV.4.65 sqq. and Pind., *Pyth*. IX.23 sqq.” *Hermes* 99: 376–378.

———. 1987. *Further Voices in Virgil’s* Aeneid. Oxford.

Mackie, H. S. 2003. *Graceful Errors: Pindar and the Performance of Praise*. Ann Arbor.

Magrath, W.T. 1977. “The Antaios Myth in Pindar.” *TAPA* 107: 203–224.

Mankin, L. 1995. *Horace. Epodes*. Cambridge.

Manning C. 1988. “*Nemean* X and the Juturna-episode in *Aeneid* XII.” *CW* 81: 221–222.

Marks, R.D. 2004. “Of Kings, Crowns, and Boundary Stones: Cipus and the *hasta Romuli* in *Metamorphoses* 15.” *TAPA* 134(1): 107–121.

Mauss, M. 1990. *The Gift: Form and Reason for Exchange in Archaic Societies*. Trans. W.D. Halls. New York.

Miller, A. M. 1981. “Pindar, Archilochus and Hieron in *P*. II.52–56.” *TAPA* 109: 135–143.

Miller, F.J. 1984. *Ovid. Metamorphoses Books 1–8*. Rev. G.P. Goold. Cambridge, MA.

———, F.J. 1984. *Ovid. Metamorphoses Books 9–15*. Rev. G.P. Goold. Cambridge, MA.

Miller, J.F. 2004/2005. “Ovid and Augustan Apollo.” *Hermathena* 177/178: 165–180.

———. 2009. “Primus Amor Phoebi.” *CW* 102(2): 168–172.

Miller, P.A. 1994. *Lyric Texts and Lyric Consciousness: The Birth of a Genre from Archaic Greece to*

*Augustan Rome.* London; New York.

Montiglio, S. 2011. *From Villain to Hero: Odysseus in Ancient Thought*. Ann Arbor.

Most, G. W. 1985. *The Measures of Praise. Structure and Function in Pindar's Second* Pythian *and Seventh* Nemean *Odes*. Göttingen.

Moulton, C. 1973. "Ovid as Anti-Augustan. *Met*. XV. 843–879." *CW* 59: 4–7.

Murray, P. 1998. "Bodies in Flux: Ovid's *Metamorphoses*." In D. Montserrat, ed. *Changing Bodies, Changing Meanings: Studies on the Human Body in Antiquity*: 80–96. London; New York.

Myers, M. Y. 2007. "Footrace, Dance, and Desire: The χορός of Danaids in Pindar's *Pythian* 9." *SIFC* (2): 230–247.

Nagle, B.R. 1984. "Amor, *Ira*, and Sexual Identity in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*." *CA* 3: 236–255.

———. 1988. "Erotic Pursuit and Narrative Seduction in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*." *Ramus* 17: 32–51

Nagy, G. 1976. "*Iambos*: Typologies of Invective and Praise." *Arethusa* 9: 191–205.

———. 1979. *Best of the Achaeans*. Baltimore.

———. *Pindar's Homer*. Baltimore.

———. 2011. "Asopos and his Multiple Daughters: Traces of Preclassical Epic in the Aeginetan Odes of Pindar." In D. Fearn, ed. *Aegina: Contexts for Choral Lyric Poetry. Myth, History, and Identity in the Fifth Century BC*: 41–78. Oxford.

Nash, L. L. 1982. "The Theban Myth at *Pythian* 9,79–103." *QUCC* 40: 77–99.

Nethercut, W. R. 1979. "Daphne and Apollo. A Dynamic Encounter." *CJ* 74: 333–347.

Newman J. K. 1985. "Pindar and Callimachus." *ICS* 10: 69–189.

Nicoll, W.S.M. 1980. "Cupid, Apollo, and Daphne (Ovid, *Met.* 1.452ff.)." *CQ* 30: 174–182.

Otis, B. 1938. “Ovid and the Augustans.” *TAPA* 69: 188-229.

———. 1966. *Ovid as an Epic Poet*. Cambridge.

Parry, A. 1963. “The Two Voices of Virgil’s *Aeneid*.” 2(4): 66–80.

Pavlock, B. 2009a. *The image of the poet in Ovid's* Metamorphoses. Madison.

———. 2009b. “Ulysses’ Wounds in the Contest over the Arms of Achilles.” *CW* 102(2): 178–181.

Pickard-Cambridge, A. 1962. *Dithyramb, Tragedy, and Comedy*. Oxford.

Putnam, M.C.J. 2004/2005. “Daphne’s Roots: In Memoriam Charles Segal.” *Hermathena* 177/178: 71–89.

Race, W. 1990. *Style and Rhetoric in Pindar’s Odes*. Atlanta.

———. 1997. *Pindar: Olympian Odes, Pythian Odes.* Cambridge, MA.

———. 1997. *Pindar: Neman Odes, Isthmian Odes*. Cambridge, MA.

Robbins, E. 1978. “Cyrene and Cheiron: The Myth of Pindar’s Ninth *Pythian*.” *Phoenix* 32(2): 91–104.

Rogers, R.S. 1966. “The Emperor’s Displeasure and Ovid.” *TAPA* 97: 373–378.

Rosati, G. 2002. “Narrative Techniques and Narrative Structures in the *Metamorphoses*.” In Boyd: 271–304.

Rose, H. J. 1931. “Iolaos and the Ninth *Pythian* Ode.” *CQ*: 156–161.

Rosen. R.M. 1988. “Hipponax Boupalos, and the Conventions of the *Psogos*.” *TAPA* 118: 29–41.

Rotstein, A. 2010. *The Idea of Iambos*. Oxford.

Salzman, M. 1998. “Deification in the *Fasti* and the *Metamorphoses*.” In C. Deroux, ed. *Studies in*

*Latin Literature and Roman History*. *Latomus* 244: 313–346.

Savage, J.J.H. 1943. "The 'Wrath' Theme in Ovid." *CW* 36(21): 245–246.

Schmid, B. 1947. *Studien zu griechischen Ktisissagen*. Freiberg.

Scott, K. 1930. "Emperor Worship in Ovid." *TAPA*: 43–69.

Segal, C. P. 1967. "Pindar's Seventh *Nemean*." *TAPA* 98: 431–480.

———. 1969. "Myth and Philosophy in the *Metamorphoses*. Ovid's Augustanism and the Augustan Conclusion to Book XV." *AJP* 90: 257–292.

———. 1998. "Ovid's Arcadia and the Characterization of Jupiter in the *Metamorphoses*." In W. Schubert, ed. *Ovid Werk und Wirkgung: Festgabe für Michael von Albrecht zum 65 Geburtstag*: Teil 1: 401–412.

———. 2001/2002. "Jupiter in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*." *Arion* 9(1): 78–99.

Simpson, M. 1969. "The Chariot and the Bow as Metaphors for Poetry in Pindar's Odes." *TAPA* 100: 437–473.

Smiley, M.T. 1914. "Callimachus' Debt to Pindar and Others." *Hermathena* 18: 46–72.

Smith, O. L. 1984. "Pindar's Seventh *Nemean* Ode." *C&M* 35: 5–17.

Smith, R.A. 1997. *Poetic Allusion and Poetic Embrace in Ovid and Virgil.* Ann Arbor.

Snell, B. and H. Mähler. 1975. *Pindar. Carmina cum Fragmentis*. Leipzig.

Solodow, J. B. 1988. *The World of Ovid's* Metamorphoses. Chapel Hill.

Stanford, W.B. 1954. *The Ulysses Theme*. Oxford.

Steele, R.B. 1900. "The Greek In Cicero's Epistles." *AJP* 21(4): 287–410.

Steiner, D. T. 2001. “Slander's Bite: *Nemean* 7, 102–105 and the Language of Invective.” *JHS* 121: 154–158.

———. 2002. “Indecorous Dining, Indecorous Speech: Pindar's First *Olympian* and the Poetics of Consumption.” *Arethusa* 35 (2): 297—314.

———. 2012. “Fables and Frames: The Poetics and Politics of Animal Fables in Hesiod, Archilochus, and the Aesopica.” *Arethusa* 45(1): 1–41.

Stephens, W. 1956. “Cupid and Venus in Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*.” *TAPA* 92: 286–300.

Stirrup B. E. 1977. “Techniques of Rape. Variety of Wit in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*.” *GR* 24: 170–184.

Syme, R. 1979. *History in Ovid*. Oxford.

Tarrant, R.J. 1995. “Ovid and the Failure of Rhetoric.” In D. Innes, H, Hine, and C Pelling, eds., *Ethics and Rhetoric: Classical Essays for Donald Russell on His Seventy-fifth Birthday*: 63–74. New York; Oxford.

———. 2004. *Ovid. Metamorphoses*. Oxford; New York.

Theodorakopoulos, E. 1999. “Closure and Transformation in Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*.” In Hardie, Barcheisi, and Hinds: 142–161.

Thibault, J.C. 1964. *The Mystery of Ovid’s Exile.* Berkeley; Los Angeles.

Thomas, R.F. 1982. *Lands and Peoples in Roman Poetry*. Cambridge.

———. 1983. “Callimachus, the *Victoria Berenices*, and Roman Poetry.” *CQ* 33: 92–113.

———. 1998. “Virgil’s Pindar?” In P.E. Knox and C. Foss, eds., *Style and Tradition: Studies in Honor of Wendell Clausen*: 99–120. Stuttgart.

———. 1999. *Reading Virgil and His Texts*. Ann Arbor.

———. 2007. “Horace and Hellenistic Poetry.” In S. Harrison, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to*

*Horace*: 50–62. Cambridge.

———. 2011. *Horace:* Odes *IV*. Cambridge

Tissol, G. 2002. "The House of Fame: Roman History and Augustan Politics in *Metamorphoses* 11–15." In B. Boyd, ed. *The Brill Companion to Ovid*: 305–335.

Van Tress, H. 2004. *Poetic Memory: Allusion in the Poetry of Callimachus and the* Metamorphoses *of Ovid.* Leiden.

Watson, L. 2003. *A Commentary on Horace's* Epodes. Oxford; New York.

West, M.L. 1974. *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus*. Berlin; New York.

White, S.A. 1999. "Callimachus Battiades." *CP* 94: 168–81.

Wickkiser, B.L. 1999. "Famous Last Words: Putting Ovid's Sphragis back into the *Metamorphoses*." *MD* 42: 113–142.

Wilkinson L. P. 1955. *Ovid Recalled*. Cambridge.

Williams, F. 1981. "Augustus and Daphne: Ovid *Metamorphoses* 1.560–563 and Phylarchus *FGrH* 81 F 32 (b)." *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar* 3: 249–257.

Williams, G.W. 1968. *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry*. Oxford.

———. 1974. "Horace *Odes* i.12 and the Succession to Augustus." *Hermathena* 118: 147–155.

Williams, G.D. 1996. *The Curse of Exile: A Study of Ovid's* Ibis." Cambridge.

Wills, J. 1990. "Callimachean Models for Ovid's 'Apollo-Daphne.'" *MD* 24: 143–156.

Winnington-Ingram, R. P. 1969. "Pindar's Ninth *Pythian* Ode." *BICS* 16: 9–15.

Woodbury, L. 1945. "The Epilogue of Pindar's Second *Pythian*." *TAPA* 76: 11–30.

———. 1972. “Apollo’s First Love: Pindar, *Pyth*. 9.26ff.” *TAPA* 103: 561–573.

Wyckoff, E. 1946. “*Pythian* II. 52–56.” *CP*: 160–162.

Young, D. C. 1970. “Pindar *Nemean* 7. Some Preliminary Remarks (vv. 1–20).” *TAPA* 101: 633–643.

Zanker, P. 1988. *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*. Trans. Alan Shapiro. Ann Arbor.

Ziogas, I. V. 2012. *Ovid and Hesiod: The Metamorphosis of the Catalogue of Women*. Cambridge; New York.